CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

journal of the oriental institute

M. S. UNIVERSITY OF BARODA, BARODA

Edited by
A. N. Jani
DIRECTOR, ORIENTAL INSTITUTE

Oriental Institute
BARODA

Vol. XXIX] March-June 1980 [Nos. 3-4

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

CONTENTS

PAGES

Puruṣa of the Sāṃkhya Philosophy and Ātman of the Vedānta Philosophy—SHINKAN MURAKAMI 169

Āruṇi of Svapnavāsavadattam of Bhāsa—A Reappraisal—SUDARSHAN KUMAR SHARMA 198

The Adaptation of Viṣṇu-Bali Legend by Jaina Writers—JAGDISH CHANDRA JAIN 209

The Cult of Sudāmā in Porbandar-Sudāmāpurī—FRANCOISE MALLISON 216

Go-Vijñāna Manuscripts in the Oriental Institute, Baroda—J. P. THAKER 224

Indian Expansion in South-East Asia: A Study in Economic Factors—VIJAY KUMAR THAKUR 240

A Note on the Indore Plate of Bhuluṇḍa—V. V. MIRASHI 252

Re-Assessment of the Meaning of "ऋणं कृत्वा घृतं पिबेत्"—MANJUL MAYANK 258

Select Contents of Oriental Journals—P. H. JOSHI 261

Reviews 267

Acknowledgements 287

M. S. University Oriental Series: No. 14

Tilakamañjarīkathoddhāra—Ed. by N. M. KANSARA Suppl. 49-72

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Journal
of the
Oriental Institute
M. S. University of Baroda

Vol. XXIX, Nos. 3-4
March-June, 1980

PURUṢA OF THE SĀṂKHYA PHILOSOPHY AND ĀTMAN OF THE VEDĀNTA PHILOSOPHY

With reference to the so-called Pañcaśikha Fragment 4

By

SHINKAN MURAKAMI, Sendai (Japan)

Introduction :

According to the interpretations of the Commentaries (*Gauḍ pādabhāṣya*, *Māṭharavṛtti*, *Yuktidīpikā*, *Jayamaṅgalā* and Paramārtha's Chinese translation of the *Suvarṇasaptati*) on *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (abbr. *SK*.) 11, the *soul* (*puruṣa*) is one and all-pervasive (*vyāpin*). And all the Commentaries admit that the *puruṣa* is motionless (*akriya*, *niṣkriya*), meaning that the *puruṣa* does not undergo the transmigration (*saṃsāra*). It may be considered that the *puruṣa* is without movement, yet exists within all, as the soul of living beings. This presupposes the all-pervasiveness of the soul. It was also Bhāvaviveka's criticism of old about the contradiction of being all-pervasive and at the same time many.

He says that if the soul (*puruṣa*) is all-pervasive, then "when one person practises virtuousness (*dharma*), everybody would abide in virtuousness, and when one person is without virtuousness, then everybody would be without virtuousness". (Compare this with the explanations of *G*. on *SK*. 18 which expound the plurality of the soul.) Bhāvaviveka also says that if the soul is all-pervasive, then "the body, the organs and the consciousness would become common with (others)". (Compare this with the argument for the plurality of the soul, the *puruṣa*, in *SK*. 18.) He also criticizes the all-pervasiveness of the soul, saying "It will result in the mistaken conclusion that when a single

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

soul is liberated, all souls are liberated". Finally he says that if the soul is all-pervasive, then "all souls (*ātman*) would become mingled together".*

When *SK.* and its Commentaries *G.* etc. teach that the soul is many, they point out the difficulties arising from the soul being one, and Bhāvaviveka points out the same kind of difficulties entailed in the case of the all-pervasive soul. That is to say, it is contradictory to say that the soul is many and at the same time all-pervasive. I would like to consider this problem in this paper.‡

1. R. Garbe's opinion about the so-called Pañcaśikha fragment 4 and its problems :—

According to R. Garbe's '*Die Sâṃkhya-Philosophie*', the *Sāṃkhya* School originally considered the soul (*puruṣa*) to be of minute size, but the fact that they later considered it to be all-pervasive, was due to the influence of the *Vedānta*.[1]

The idea that the soul is of minute size is based upon a so-called Pañcaśikha Fragment (No. 4 acc Garbe) :[2]

> "Cognizing the *ātman* of minute size, in this way he first knows 'I am'" (*tam aṇumātram ātmānam anuvidya- asmi-ity evaṃ tāvat saṃprajānīte*).[3]

Garbe translates '*aṇumātra*' (of minute size) as 'atomgross', and construes that the *ātman* is of the size of an atom, an extremely minute thing. In contrast to this, it can be understood that the soul (*puruṣa*) is all-pervasive, from the Commentaries of *SK.* 11. Concerning this, he says

> "Therefore all the other Teachers of the *Sāṃkhya*, after Īśvarakṛṣṇa explain that the soul goes everywhere, is all-pervasive, and is infinitely great (*vibhu, vyāpaka, paramamahat*), in contrast to Pañcaśikha, and herein the influence of the *Vedānta* Philosophy upon our system is unmistakable".[4]

And he says that this influence occurred between Pañcaśikha and the period of the *SK.*, that is, between the first and fifth centuries A.D. He also says that if

---

* *Tarkajvālā*, sDe-dge ed. Tohoku Catalogue No. 3856 fol. 233a^6-b^7; Peking ed. (*The Tibetan Tripiṭaka* Vol. 96, No. 5256) fol. 261b^3-262a^3. In detail, see my paper 'On the singleness of *puruṣa* in the *Sāṃkhya* Philosophy' in the '*Reports of the Research Institute for Japanese Culture*' No. 10, Tohoku University, Sendai 1974.

† This paper is an amended version of the Japanese text published in '*The Annual Reports of the Faculty of Arts and Letters*', Tohoku University, Vol. XXIV, Sendai 1974.

The English translation was done with the aid of Stephen Hodge.

1 Garbe Richard, *Die Sāṃkhya-Philosophie*, "eine Darstellung des indischen Rationalismus", 2 Aufl., Leipzig 1917, pp. 361-362.

2 See n. 12.

3 *Yogasūtrabhāṣya ad Yogasūtra* 1.36.

4 Garbe, R., *op. cit.*, p. 361, See n. 12.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

one accepts the doctrine of the all-pervasiveness of the soul, it must be understood to be motionless (*niṣkriya*).[5]

However in my opinion, his assumption raises the following problems :

(i) Concerning the historical placing of Pañcaśikha: whether it is appropriate to attribute this fragment to Pañcaśikha. A number of fragments have been attributed to Pañcaśikha by Vācaspati Miśra's account, but there is the problem of the reliability of these attributions.

(ii) The meaning of this fragment, particularly the explanation of '*aṇu*'.

(iii) The problem of the debate concerning the size of the *ātman* in the *Vedānta* School and its original position. I.e. we must consider the fact that there was much debate within the *Vedānta* School in the explanations about the *ātman* and the Highest Self (*paramātman*). According to his foot-note, Garbe's understanding of the *Vedānta* Philosophy is based upon Paul Deussen's '*Das System des Vedânta nach den Brahmasûtra's des Bâdarâyaṇa und dem Kommentare des Çaṅkara über dieselben*' (Leipzig 1906). This book is an interpretation of Śaṅkara's Commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra*, but the original meaning of the *Brahma-sūtra* does not necessarily coincide with that of Śaṅkara's explanations.

I shall deal with these three main points below.

II. Problems of Pañcaśikha's date and the attribution of the fragments :

According to the tradition of the *Sāṃkhya* School, the *Sāṃkhya* doctrine was founded by Kapila, who imparted it to Āsuri, Āsuri taught it to Pañcaśikha, by him the doctrine was enlarged.[6] But the names of these three are embedded in myth and tradition. The three are counted among the *ṛṣitarpaṇa* ritual.[7] The name of Pañcaśikha (abbr. *P.*) as a *Sāṃkhya* teacher also appears in the *Mahābhārata*, and the teachings attributed to him are related in verses.[8] It is said that he belonged to the Parāśara clan,[9] and also taught King Janaka of Mithila. Yājñavalkya who is recorded in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad* etc. is famous as a philosopher with deep connections with King Janaka, but it seems as if *P.* took the place here of Yājñavalkya of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Up.*[10]

There are several fragments quoted in the *Yogasūtrabhāṣya* (abbr. *YSBh.*) without mention of their author, and Vācaspati Miśra in his *Tattvavaiśāradī*

5 Garbe, R., *op. cit.*, p. 362.

6 *SK.* 70.

7 *Gauḍapādabhāṣya ad SK.* 1.

Cf. Oberhammer, G., *WZKSO* IV, 1960, p. 79; Garbe, R., *Sāṃkhya-Philosophie*, p. 64.

8 Kinjawaḍekar, R., (Ed.), *Mahābhārata*, Poona 1932, XII. 218-129, 319-320, (= Sukthankar, V. S., Belvalkar, S. K., Critically ed., Poona, 1954, XII. 211-212, 307-308); Deussen, P., *Vier Philosophische Texte des Mahābhāratam* XII. 218-219, 321-322.

9 *Mahābhārata* (Poona ed.), XII. 320.24 (= Critical ed., XII. 308. 24, Deussen's translation XII. 322.24.).

10. Garbe, R., *Sāṃkhya-Philosophie*, pp. 66-67.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

(*TV*) attributes these to P. There are utterances attributed to *P.* in later documents also. These are the so-called Pañcaśikha Fragments.

Fits-Edward Hall was the first to gather the *P.* Fragments,[11] and Garbe affixed serial numbers to twelve fragments, and translated them into German [12] Also Hakuju Ui dealt with seventeen fragments and translated them into Japanese.[13] Har Dutt Sharma has also presented them.[14]

All the fragments dealt with by Garbe come from *YSBh.* (1.25, 1.4, 2.13, 1.36, 2.5, 2.6, 2.17, 2.18, 2.20=4.22, 2.22, 3.13, 3-40[15]). They were attributed to *P.* upon the authority of Vācaspati Miśra. Besides these twelve fragments, there also appear some attributed to *P.* in Vijñānabhikṣu's Commentary, the *Sāṃkhya-pravacanabhāṣya*, upon *Sāṃkhya-Sūtra* v.32-35, vi.68, and 1.127. However he does not utilize the stanzas quoted as *P.*'s in Vijñānabhikṣu's Commentary on the *Brahma sūtra* and the *Yogavārttika*. It is said that these stanzas originate in the *Sāṃkhyakramadīpikā* (*Tattvasamāsasūtravṛtti*), the commentary upon the *Tattvasamāsa*. According to Garbe, all the mss. say it is *P.*'s work. However this is just an attempt to give reputability to a modern work by attributing it to an old famous name. The fact that the *Sāṃkhyakramadipikā* is a modern work can be seen at a glance from its language and content. Even the *Tattvasamāsa* itself need not be placed very much earlier. For these reasons Garbe does not recognise the verses as *P.*'s.[16]

Garbe considers *P.* to have lived during the first century A.D. His reasons are as follows. *P.* defines '*vyāpti*' (invariable concomitance, distribution) in *SK.* v. 2-35, however he does it in the way that diverges from a formal definition, but in P.'s age, logical investigations were not only being widely carried

---

11 Hall, Fitz-Edward, *Sāṃkhya-sāra*; *A Treatise of Sāṃkhya Philosophy* (Bibliotheca Indica), Calcutta, 1862, pp. 21-25, (foot-notes).

12 Garbe, R., "Pañcaśikha und seine Fragmente" ("*Festgruss an Rudolf von Roth zum Doktor-Jubiläum*", Stuttgart, 1893).

13 Hakuju Ui, Sāṁkhyayoga ni tsuite", *Tetsugaku Zasshi*, No. 379, (Vol. 33, Tokyo, 191', pp. 87-97.

14 Sharma, Har Dutt, The *Sāṃkhya-Kārikā*, Iśvara Kṛṣṇa's Memorable Verses on *Sāṁkhya* Philosophy with the Commentary of Gauḍapādācārya, Poona 1933, pp. 14-15 (Introduction), The *Tattva-Kaumudī* Vācaspati Miśra's Commentary on the *Sāṁkhya-Kārikā*. Translated into English by Mahāmahopādhyāya Ganganatha Jha with Introduction and Critical Notes by Sharma, Har Dutt, Revized and Re-edited by Patkar, M. M., Poona Oriental Series No. 10, Poona 1965, pp. 12-13.

Both omit Pañcaśikha Fragments 8, 9 and 10 (according to Garbe). Mainkar, T. G. *Sāṁkhya Kārikā* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa with the Commentary of *Gauḍapādabhāṣya*, Poona, 2nd ed. 1972, pp. 16-17 also gives the text of the Pañcaśikha Fragments, but they are taken from Sharma together with the omissions.

15 Hall and Garbe give *YSBh.* 3.40, but in my text, and also according to Sharma it i *YSBh.* 3.41.

16 Garbe, R., *Sāṃkhya-Philosophie*, S. 68 Anm. 2.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

out, but also the fact that the technical terms peculiar to the Nyāya Philosophy had been established, proves it. The *Nyāya* System did not exist around 300 B.C., and perhaps not for two or three hundred years later. Also when we examine the fragments of *P.* contained in *YSBh.* their language (Sprache) presents a definite protest against their author being anterior or contemporary with the Buddha. The Buddhists knew of a demigod Pañcaśikha, but it is much older than the *Sāṃkhya* teacher of the same name. Also at the end of *YSBh.* I 25, *P.* says that the First Knower taught the doctrine to Āsuri, but he does not say that Āsuri did the same for him. It is conceivable that the expression 'First Knower' was to eliminate the idea that this Knower was his own teacher. It is saying in fact that Kapila and Āsuri were of the dim past for *P.*[17]

In this way, Garbe places *P.* in the first century A.D. as the author of these fragments, from their analysis.

H. Ui also places *P.*[18] in the first century A.D. He says that if one views Vārṣagaṇya as 200-300 A.D. from Vasubandhu's Biography, and places Gārga and Ulūka between him and *P.*, *P.* is roughly prior to 10 A.D., i.e. during the first century A.D.

However the lineage of transmission from *P.* to Īśvarakṛṣṇa differs among the various commentaries on *SK.* 71.[19] In Paramārtha's Chinese translation of the *Suvarṇasaptati* three persons intervene between *P.* and Īśvarakṛṣṇa. The *Māṭharavṛtti* (abbr. *M.*) gives the names of five persons but indicates an abbreviation with the word 'etc'. The *Yuktidīpikā* (*Y.*) gives ten names and then has 'etc'., and the *Jayamaṅgalā* (*J.*) gives two names also indicating an abbreviation with 'etc'. There is no agreement in the number of teachers between *P.* and Īśvarakṛṣṇa, nor in the names handed down. There seems to be almost no possibility to date *P.* from this point.

17 Garbe, R., *op. cit.*, pp. 69-70.

18 Hakuju Ui, *Tetsugaku Zasshi*, No. 379, p. 1059.

19

M.	*Suvarṇasaptati*	*Y.*	*J.*
Kapila	Kapila	Kapila —	Kapila
Āsuri	Āsuri	Āsuri	Āsuri
Pañcaśikha	Pañcaśikha	Pañcaśikha	Pañcaśikha
Bhārgava	Gārga	Hārīta	Gārga
Ulūka	Ulūka	Bāddhali	Gautama
Vālmīki	Po-p'o-li	Kairāta	etc.
		Paurika	
Hārīta	etc.	Ṛṣabheśvara	
Devala		Pañcādhikaraṇa	
etc.		Patañjali	
		Vārṣagaṇya	
		Kauṇḍinya	
		Mūka etc.	
Īśvarakṛṣṇa	Īśvarakṛṣṇa	Īśvarakṛṣṇa	Īśvarakṛṣṇa

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Garbe makes the concept of '*vyāpti*' in the *P.* Fragments a basis for his dating theory, but recently G. Oberhammer has voiced differing opinions on this matter.[20]

> "With the words *ādheyaśaktiyoga iti Pañcaśikhaḥ*, the definition of *vyāpti* of a Pañcaśikha is given. The problem of *vyāptiḥ* is, however, a fresh one. In its oldest form it can be traced back to Vṛṣagaṇa's question about the nature of the *saṃbandhaḥ*[21]. But that seems to be much more archaic than the theory of the Pañcaśikha of the *Sāṃkhyasūtras*, and it presupposes a much higher level of abstraction in the posing of the problem than Vṛṣagaṇa's. Further it must be observed that, since we can survey roughly the development of the theory of inference, a doctrine of *vyāptiḥ* such as we find it in Pañcaśikha's fragment can not be historically fitted into the period of the old Pañcaśikha. Thus, we can conclude that the teacher who defined *vyāptiḥ* as *ādheyaśaktiyogaḥ* is to be dated later than Vṛṣagaṇa and cannot possibly be identified with the old Pañcaśikha. As to whether the hypothesis of a younger Pañcaśikha is to be accepted on these grounds cannot yet be decided on the material available at the moment."

If we think in this way, there is almost no basis for the author of even *P.* Fragment 4 to be of the first century A.D., and he can only be considered as prior to *YSBh.*, and perhaps not too distant in time from *SK.* And if the *P.* who made the definition touched on before is a different person to the author of *P.* Fragment 4, then we know nothing but that the author of the Fragment 4 is before *YSBh.* but he is not necessarily after Vṛṣagaṇa.

Garbe said that all the teachers after Īśvarakṛṣṇa consider that the soul is all-pervasive and infinitely large, under the influence of the Vedānta Philosophy, in contrast to *P.* Fragment 4 which states that the *ātman* is of the size of an atom, and this influence took place between the first century and the fifth century. But the information concerning that date cannot be confirmed here.

G. Oberhammer says of the author of the so-called *P.* fragments :

> "We shall first examine the value of the historical testimony given by Vācaspatimiśra concerning Pañcaśikha. If we fix ca. 500 A.D. for the *Yogabhāṣyam*, Vācaspati appears at least 300 years later, and the interval between Vācaspati and Pañcaśikha is several centuries more. So the testimony of Vācaspati on that question would have weight only if there are other cogent reasons to attribute these fragments to Pañcaśikha, but we lack such reasons. On the contrary, whenever an old source like the

---

20 Oberhammer, G., "The Authorship of the Ṣaṣṭitantraṃ", *WZKSO* IV. 1960, p. 89.

21 Oberhammer, G., *op. cit.*, p. 89, foot-note 57, gives E. Frauwallner : "Zur Erkenntnislehre des klassischen Sāṃkhyasystems," *WZKSO*, Bd. II, p. 123; Cf. *Jayamaṅgalā*, pp. 8, 9-15 and *Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭikā*, p. 165, 2 (K.S.S. No. 24).

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Yuktidīpikā preserves one of these fragments and mentions its author, we find that Vācaspati's attribution is not correct. If Vācaspati ascribes the quotation : *ekam eva darśanam khyātireva darśanam* (*TV.* on *YS.* 1.4, *P.* Fragment 1) to Pañcaśikha, the *Yuktidīpikā* mentions it as taken from the *Śāstram* (p. 36.1.18), a work which is cited in several places in the same text. Further the quotation *rūpātiśayā . . pravartante* in the *Yogabhāṣyam* is also attributed to Pañcaśikha by Vācaspati (*TV.* on *YS.* 3.13, *P.* Fragment 11), whereas the *Yuktidīpikā* attributes it to Vṛṣagaṇa (p. 61, 1.19), who appears to be well known to this work even to the very details of his teachings. This fact makes this attribution absolutely authentic ".[22]

After dealing with the fragments of Vṛṣagaṇa quoted in *YSBh.* (3.53, 3.13 = 2.15, 4.13, 3.14)[23], he says that Vṛṣagaṇa is one of the authorities for *YSBh.*, and these findings are based on sources older than Vācaspati and therefore more reliable, but " It is quite the opposite with regard to the Pañcaśikha-fragments which are nothing but anonymous quotations attributed to Pañcaśikha by Vācaspati alone several hundred years later and so cannot be accepted as really such ".[24]

He thinks that the reason for Vācaspati attributing anonimous quotations to *P.* is as follows :

" The commentary translated by Paramārtha into Chinese ca. 550 A.D. speaks of a work of Pañcaśikha containing 60,000 verses. The same commentary tells us in another passage that the Sixty Categories—generally known as the subject-matter of the *Ṣaṣṭitantraṁ*—had been the subject of this work of 60,000 verses. .... On the basis of this fact a later period attributed to Pañcaśikha also the special work called *Ṣaṣṭitantraṁ*. This attribution became all the more possible since the knowledge about its real author was steadily fading while the name of Pañcaśikha was kept alive through the centuries, thanks to the epic and its tradition. But the historical truth has been thereby distorted. In a later commentary on the *Sāṃ-*

---

22 Oberhammer, G., *WZKSO* IV, 1960, pp. 80-81. Annotations in parentheses added by the present author.

23 The Fragment in *YSBh.* 3.53 is attributed by *YSBh.* itself to Vṛṣagaṇa (Vārṣagaṇya according to the text). The Fragment in 3.13 = 2.15 is considered as a Fragment of Pañcaśikha (No. 11), however according to *Y.* (p. 61, 1.19) it is attributed to Vṛṣagaṇa (*Y.* has Vārṣagaṇya). According to Vācaspati, the Fragment in *YSBh.* 4.13 is from Vṛṣagaṇa (*ṣaṣṭitantraśāstra*). According to *Dvādaśāranayacakra* p. 320, 2-4 (= *Gaekwad's Oriental Series* No. CXVI p. 267, 1.28-31) the Fragment in *YSBh.* 3.14 is attributed to Vṛṣagaṇa (Vārṣagaṇa tantra, *GOS.No.* CXVI, p. 280, 1.13).

Following Frauwallner, Oberhammer uses ' Vṛṣagaṇa ', though ' Vārṣagaṇya ' would be more common.

24 Oberhammer, G., *op. cit.*, p. 81.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

khyakārikā, the *Jayamaṅgalā*, the author of the *Ṣaṣṭitantraṃ* is in fact identified with Pañcaśikha.... As has already been correctly pointed out by Hara Datta Sarma[25], Vācaspati refers very probably to an opinion of the *Jayamaṅgalā* in his *Tattvakaumudī* on *Kā* 51, and so presupposes the former. Therefore he might really have been of the opinion that the *Ṣaṣṭitantraṃ* and the tradition of the school connected with it originated from Pañcaśikha".[26]

Together with E. Frauwallner, he considers Vṛṣagaṇa as the author of the *Ṣaṣṭitantra*, and according to him *P.* was the past authority, but he is not alluded to in the classical *Sāṃkhya* works. From the fourth century to the promulgation of *SK.*, Vṛṣagaṇa was the representative of the *Sāṃkhya*. However he and his works were later forgotten, and the name of *P.*, famed in the epic and the *Purāṇas*, took it over.[27] Also according to him the *Ṣaṣṭitantra* of Vṛṣagaṇa can be largely reconstructed.[28]

Oberhammer says that Vācaspati presupposes *J.* in accordance with the views of Sarma which are based on the fact that after the eight kinds of *siddhis* (attainments) are explained in the commentary on *SK.* 51, different explanations are introduced concerning it, and those have many word for word agreements with *J.* However in the case that we view Vācaspati as not having directly used *J.* but having quoted from the same source as *J.*, Sarma's theory cannot consequently admit the above opinion of Oberhammer as it is. But there is no conclusive answer to the problem of the author and date of *J*, so I propose to set this aside as I cannot at present draw any decisive conclusions.

According to Oberhammer, the information of Vācaspati is erroneous about *P.* On the other hand, he considers the fragment "*guṇānāṃ paramaṃ rūpaṃ*... ... *sutucchakaṃ*" quoted in *YSBh.* 4.13 to originate in the *Ṣaṣṭitantra*, in his *Tattvavaiśāradī*. On the other hand in the *Bhāmatī* (*ad Brahmasūtra* 2.1.3) he attributes it to Vārṣagaṇya. Oberhammer also in his exposition considers it correct to attribute the *Ṣaṣṭitantra* to Varṣagaṇya. In this case Vācaspati is right.

Concerning the fact that the previous mentioned *P.* Fragment 11 (*YSBh.* 3.13) is attributed to *P.* by Vācaspati and to Vārṣagaṇya in *Y* (p. 61.1.19), some scholars propose that Kapila formulated the nucleus of *Sāṃkhya* and *P.*

---

25 Sarma, Haradatta, *Jayamaṅgalā* and the other Commentaries on *Sāṃkhya Saptati* (*Indian Historical Quarterly* Vol. IV, Calcutta 1928), p. 428f.
Haradatta Sarma is the same person as Har Dutt Sharma.

26 Oberhammer, G., *op. cit.*, pp. 82-83.

27 Oberhammer, G., *op. cit.*, pp. 71-91, particularly p. 90.

28 Frauwallner, E., "Zur Erkenntnislehre des klassischen Sāṃkhya systems", *WZKSO* Band II 1958, pp. 84-139. This is a reconstruction of the epistemological sections of the *Ṣaṣṭitantra* using Jinendrabuddhi's Commentary on Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, Siṃhasūri's Commentary on Mallavādin's *Dvādaśāranayacakra*, and the *Yuktidīpikā*.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

propagated the system into a huge treatise of verse, and later on Vārṣagaṇya rewrote the text of *P.*, and as a result of this, the original text of verse became an admixture of prose and verse, though such assumptions remain purely conjectural.[29]

E. Frauwallner also suspects the *P.* fragments,[30] though he proposes to allocate the introduction of the theory of 25 principles, and the theory of evolution to *P.* as only a convenient working hypothesis.[31]

It is undecided whether there is some truth in Vācaspati's information about P. At present it is just a convenient convention to use the name 'P. Fragment'.

III Meaning of the so-called Pañcaśikha Fragment 4 :

The *P.* Fragment 4 is quoted in Vyāsa's Commentary (*Yogasūtrabhāṣya*, abbr. *YSBh.*) on *Yogasūtra* (*YS.*) 1.36. The *Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivaraṇa* (*Vv*),[32] attributed to Śaṅkara, Vācaspatimiśra's *Tattvavaiśāradī* (*TV*), and Vijñānabhikṣu's *Yogavārttika* (*Yv.*)[33] are the sub-commentaries on *YSBh.*

Now, while referring to these, let us consider the meaning of the fragment. *YS.* 1.36 says

> " Or the griefless (and) luminous (sense activity when arisen establishes steadiness of the mental organ (*manas*) " [34]

and Vyāsa's Commentary explains this in the following way :

> " (The context of the text) continues—the (sense) activity when arisen establishes steadiness of the mental organ (*manas*). When one concentrates in the lotus of the heart, there arises the realization of the consciousness (*buddhisaṃvid*). The clearness of the consciousness (*buddhisattva*) is, in fact, luminous, (and) and it is like space. Since

29 Shingen Takagi, " Fragments from Vārṣagaṇya and his Followers (I) ", The *Mikkyo Bunka* Vol. 62, Koyasan Univ. 1963, p. 132.

Chakravarti, P., *Origin and Development of the Sāṃkhya System of Thought* p. 126.

30 Frauwallner, E. *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie* I Band, Salzburg, 1953, p. 284.

31 Frauwallner, E., *op. cit.*, pp. 300f.

32 *Pātañjala-Yogasūtra-Bhāṣya Vivaraṇaṃ* of Śaṅkara-Bhagavatpāda, Critically edited with Introduction by Polakam Sri Rama Sastri and S. R. Krishnamurthi Sastri (*Madras Government Oriental Series* No. XCIV) Madras 1952 (This includes *YS.* and *YSBh.*. This edition is abbreviated as *MGOS.*).

Cf. Hacker, P., Śaṅkara der Yogin und Śaṅkara der Advaitin einige Beobachtungen, Beiträge zur Geschichte Indiens Festschrift für Erich Frauwallner, Wien 1968, pp. 119-148.

33 *The Kashi Sanskrit Series* No. 110, The *Sāṁga Yogadarśana* or *Yoga Darśana* of Patañjali with the Scholium of Vyāsa and the Commentaries——*Tattva Vaiśārdi*, *Pātañjala Rahasya*, *Yogavārtika* and *Bhāsvatī* of Vācaspati Miśra, Rāghavānanda Sarasvatī, Vijñāna Bhikṣu and Hariharānanda Āraṇya, Benares 1935 (abbreviated as *KSS.*).

34 The parts in parentheses have been added from the following *YSBh.*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

it is skilfully steadied (*sthiti-vaiśāradyāt*)[35] therein, the (sense) activity changes to the appearance of the sun, the moon, the stars, jewels, or light. In the same way, the mind (*citta*), which has entered a state of equipoise in the self-consciousness (*asmitā*), being tranquil and boundless, like a waveless ocean, becomes self-consciousness alone (*asmitāmātra*). In this connection, it is said,

'Cognizing the *ātman* of minute size (*āṇumātra*), in this way he first knows 'I am'.

This griefless (sense activity) is two-fold, that which has an object, and that which is the self-consciousness alone. It is called luminous (sense) activity,[36] by means of which the yogin's mind attains the state of steadiness (*sthitipada*)".

The *Sūtra* is one of the series relating to methods of steadying the mind or mental organ. As seen above, Vyāsa's Commentary relates that by one kind of concentration, by the concentration on the self-consciousness, the mind becomes self-consciousness alone, that is, pure self-consciousness. It is in connection with this that the *P.* Fragment 4 is quoted. When we consider its bearing on the *sūtra* (*YS.* 1.36), it seems that it is the activity (*pravṛtti*) which is explained, at the point where the steadiness of the mental organ arises. The word '*pravṛtti*', translated as 'activity', appears in the previous line (*YS.* 1.35). According to Vyāsa's Commentary it is awareness of odour, flavour, form, touch and sound, however it is not simply the normal objective cognition, but the special cognition which cognizes or realizes in concentration. I.e. as follows :

"When one concentrates upon the fore of the nose, there is the realization of divine odour, that is, the activity of odour. In the tip of the tongue, the realization of flavour. in the upper plate, the realization of form, in the centre of the tongue, the realization of touch, in the root of the tongue, the realization of sound. When the above activities arise, they firmly establish the steadiness of the mind, and dispel doubt. Also they become the entrance to the wisdom of *samādhi* (meditation)".

Rather than being only sense activity, such activity may be thought of as mental activity or mental functioning.[37] In the present *YS.* 1.36 it says that when the griefless and luminous 'activity' arises it establishes the mental steadiness. This Vyāsa explains as the two types of 'activity' "that which has an object, and

35 In Śaṅkara's *Vv.* he has *sthiti-vaiṣamyāt* for *sthiti-vaiśaradyāt*.

36 Cf. explanations of *Vv.* and *Yv.* See n. 38.

37 Woods, J. W., ('The Yoga system of Patañjali', *Harward Oriental Series* Vol. 17 always translates '*pravṛtti*' as 'sense-activity'. (pp. 72-74).

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

that which is the self-consciousness alone ".[38] In the case of the latter, it can be seen that the *P.* Fragment 4 is quoted in connection with " the mind becomes self-consciousness alone ".

Going into this a little further, I would like to refer to the sub-commentaries (*Vv. TV. Yv.*). At the beginning of Vyāsa's Commentary it is said " When one concentrates in the lotus of the heart, there arises the realization of the consciousness (*buddhi-saṃvid*) ". *TV.* and *Yv.* give detailed explanations about the lotus of the heart. The lotus of the heart is simply the heart, but its shape is probably seen as a lotus. Now, according to *TV.* (and *Yv.*) there are within the heart the four : sun, moon, fire and space, in sequence from the bottom and to these there are allocated a, u, m and half a mora (*ardhamātrā*); and the waking state, the dream state, the deep sleep state, and the fourth state respectively. Also in the pericarp of the lotus of the heart, there is the ' *suṣumnā* ' vessel. It is said that this vessel is the abode of the mind (*cittasthāna*), but at the same time, the external sun etc. are interwoven with it. The mind is concentrated therein. *TV.* and *Yv.* explain the " concentrate in the lotus of the heart " of *YSBh.* as to concentrate in the *suṣumnā* i.e. the abode of the mind. This means in short the mental concentration in the mind, but according to what is said by *TV.* and *Yv.*, this ' mind ' also includes within it the sun, the moon, fire, and space.

---

38 There is a subtle difference among the Sub-commentaries on the explanation of the two kinds of activities of the mind. In Śaṅkara's explanation (*Vv.*) it is :

activity (*pravṛtti*) { realization of odour etc. (*gandha-saṃvid*) ..... having object (*viṣayavatī*) } griefless (*viśokā*)
self-consciousness alone (*asmitāmātrā*) ..... luminous (*jyotiṣmatī*) }

In Vācaspati-Miśra's explanation (*TV*) two kinds of the mental activities are :

{ having various forms of splendour (*nānāprabhārūpā*)
{ luminous, having the form of the self-consciousness alone (*jyotiṣmatī, asmitāmātrarūpā*)

In Vijñānabhikṣu's explanation (*Yv.*) he seems to understand two kind of the mental activities as follows :

griefless (*viśokā*) { having object (*viṣayavatī*) ..... activity of odour etc. — (*gandhādipravṛtti*) — } activity (*pravṛtti*)
luminous (*jyotiṣmatī*) { self-consciousness alone — (*asmitāmātrā*) ..... activity of self-consciousness (*asmitāpravṛtti*) }

The above is from his last explanation. As in his first comment he says that when one oncentrates in the heart, there arise the realization of the consciousness and the self-consciousess alone, it seems as if he divides the mental activities in two i.e. the realization of the consciousess (*buddhisaṃvid*) and the self-consciousness alone (*asmitāmātra*). But in his last comment, n reply to the question of a opponent, he says that the relalization of the consciousness has not ally an object, and " In the consciousness (*buddhi*) as one experiences directly the *puruṣa* (soul), he word ' object ' is only secondary (metaphorical) ". Consequently the realization of the onsciousness is to mean the direct experience of the *puruṣa*. In this way my understanding of s classifieation of the mental activities as shown above would be correct.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

YSBh. says that 'the realization of the consciousness (*buddhi-saṃvid*)' arises by such mental concentration. In *Vv.* 'the realization of the consciousness' is interpreted as the cognition of one's own substance (*svarūpa-saṃvedana*). In *TV.* it is the realization of the mind (*citta-saṃvid*). In *Yv.* it is the direct experience of the mind (*citta-sākṣātkāra*). So they all replace 'consciousness' (*buddhi*) with 'mind' (*citta*). If we take the above into consideration, the realization of the consciousness is perhaps to know one's own mind.

Subsequently, *TV.* says that the consciousness (*buddhi*) is the mental organ (*manas*) and not the Great Principle (*mahat*), i.e. *buddhi* of the *Sāṃkhya*. *TV.* views consciousness (*buddhi*) = mind (*citta*) = mental organ (*manas*). Also the next statement of *TV.* that the *manas* (mental organ) arises from the '*vaikārika-ahaṃkāra*' (modified self-awareness) is based on *SK.* 25. According to that, the organs beginning with the mental organ (*manas*) appear from the '*vaikṛta-ahaṃkāra* (modified self-awareness). *TV.* also mentions "the mental organ (*manas*) which is the result of the self-consciousness (*asmitākārya*)", and regards that the self-consciousness as equal to the self-awareness (*ahaṃkāra*) of the *Sāṃkhya*. Since the mental organ (*manas*) arises from the self-awareness, that is, the self-consciousness, it can be said to be the result of the self-consciousness. *Vv.* also considers the self-consciousness (*asmitā*) as the self-awareness (*ahaṃkāra*), but it does not regard the consciousness (*buddhi*) as the mental organ (*manas*).

Next *YSBh.* says "The mind (*citta*) which has entered a state of equipoise in the self-consciousness (*asmitā*).....becomes self-consciousness alone (*asmitāmātra*)". Concerning this *Vv.* explains "Since the clearness of the consciousness (*buddhisattva*) which has entered a state of equipoise in the self-consciousness (*asmitā*) i.e. the self-awareness (*ahaṃkāra*), becomes equal to one's own nature,.....it becomes self-consciousness alone". It replaces the mind (*citta*) of *YSBh.* with the clearness of the consciousness (*buddhisattva*). The clearness of the consciousness is the luminosity of consciousness, or simply the lucidity of mind. *Vv.* says "It is said with regard to this : concerning the equipoise in the self-consciousness (*asmitāsamāpatti*),"[39] and shifts on to an explanation of the *P.* Fragment 4.

As concerns the Fragment, *Vv.* explains '*ātmānam*' of the Fragment with '*asmitātmānam ahaṃkāram*' (the self-awareness, having the self-consciousness as its nature). It is not the *ātman* itself, but the self-awareness (*ahaṃkāra*). The *ātman* and the self-awareness are compared to a crystal and a coloured mat. Just as the transparent crystal appears to have the colour of the mat, so also the *ātman* is limited by the self-awareness, and seems to resemble the self-awareness.

39 Concerning '*samāpatti*' (the state of equipoise), see *YSBh.* ad *YS.* 1.41.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

" Since (the *ātman*) resembles it (the self-awareness) only by the nature of the self-awareness, (the *ātman*) is limited " has such a meaning. In the same way, the *ātman* of minute size indicates that it is limited by the self-awareness.

TV. says " After indicating the equipoise (*samāpatti*) within the mental organ which is the result of the self-consciousness, he describes the essence of equipoise with regards to the self-consciousness (*asmitāsamāpatti*) ", and gives the above passage from *YSBh.* And it says " The self-consciousness alone is not that which again has various forms of splendour. ". In *YSBh.* it says that the ' equipoise in the mental organ ' indicates ' the activity of the mind changes to the appearance of the sun, the moon, stars, jewels, or light '. The mind's activity at that stage is " that which has various form of splendour ". 'The mind equipoised in the self-consciousness ' would be a further stage on.

It is concerning that the so-called *P.* Fragment is quoted, and after saying " making his own opinion correspond to other scripture ", *TV.* continues " On this, *P.* has said thus ". He speaks as though the P. Fragment originated in some other scripture (*āgama*). Also it is only *TV.* that mentions P.'s name here. Moreover the credibility of *TV.*'s proposition that attributes the Fragment to P is, as mentiond before, doubtful.

Concerning the ' *aṇu* ' of ' *aṇumātra* ' in the Fragment, *TV.* says " because it is hard of access (to knowledge) (*duradhigamatvāt*) ". So it considers ' minute ' (*aṇu*) to mean ' hard of access ', ' hard to recognize '. *TV.* also considers the *ātman* as that which has the self-awareness as its basis (*ahaṃkārāspada*).[40] It says the *ātman* is based upon the self-awareness, that it settles upon that. That is, it supposes that the *ātman* is known by the self-awareness, self-consciousness, that ' I am ' or ' I exist '.

The concept of the self-consciousness in *Yv.* differs from *TV.* and *Vv.* Both *TV.* and *Vv.* consider the self-consciousness to be the self-awareness. But Vijñānabhikṣu says that " the self-consciousness (*asmitā*) in this case is not the self-awareness (*ahaṃkāra*), but rather the principle of the *ātman* (*ātmatattva*). " And the self-consciousness (*asmitā*), the *ātman*-nature (*ātmatā*) and the self-nature (*ahantā*) are given as synonyms. Also he identifies this self-consciousness to ' the soul as mere separated spirituality (*viviktacinmātrapuruṣa*) '. When one concentrates the mind with regard to this self-consciousness i.e. the sould (*puruṣa*), the mind is tranquil and boundless like the soul (*puruṣa*), and ' becomes self-consciousness alone which has ' I am ' alone as its form. ' Moreover this is also called the direct experience of the *ātman* (*ātma-sākṣātkāra*). It is with regards to this that the P. Fragment is quoted. The Fragment is utilized to indicate the basis that the self-consciousness (*asmitā*) is the (*ātman*).

40 The interpretation of this phrase is based upon J. H. Woods' translation i.e. " The self has the personality-substance as its basis " (p. 75).

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

As we have seen above, the direct experience of the *ātman* can be considered as the direct experience of the individual self (*Jīvātma-sākṣātkāra*) and Yv. states that "direct experience of the individual self is the cause of the tranquilizing of the mind, with regard to the Highest Self (*paramātman*)". It seems that the mind is established in the Highest Self by the direct experience of the individusl self. We may consider that it is presupposed that the individual self and the Highest Self herein are identical.[41]

Now let us consider the *P.* Fragment a little further. As we have already seen in the sub-commentaries (*Vv. TV. Yv.*), this Freagment was quoted concerning the state where in the equipoise vis à vis the self-consciousness it becomes just self-consciousness. It is to be seen that this fragment is speaking of the state where it has become self-consciousness alone. That is, the second half of the Fragment "he first knows in this way 'I am'", is to be considered as explaining the self-consciousness alone (*asmitāmātra*) of Vyāsa's Commentary, as the sub-commentaries also explain (particularly *Yv.*). It would be implied that the self-consciousness (*asmitā*) is the awareness that 'I am' or 'I exist' (*asmi*), and here the existence of the *ātman* is indicated.

No speculations deriving the existence of the *ātman* from the self-consciousness are to be found in *SK.* and its Commentaries, but it is a mode of thought well known elsewhere, in the *Vaiśeṣika, Vedānta* etc.[42] It could be said that the first half of the Fragment 'cognizing the *ātman* of minute size' is an indication of such speculations.

Here the *ātman* is qualified as '*aṇumātra*'. Let us next consider its meaning. If '*aṇu*' means a particle or atom, and '*mātra*' indicates quantity, size etc. it signifies the size of a particle, atom. It is according to this explanation that Garbe translates it as 'atomgross'.[43] But it is not the only explanation. '*Mātra*' also means 'only' or 'merely', so it means 'only atomic'. J. W. Woods translates it 'a mere atom' by this meaning. On the other hand, '*aṇu*' also has the meaning of 'fine, minute' as an adjective. At first glance it seems to be under-

---

41 The word 'Highest Self' (*paramātman*) is not used in *YS.* as well as in *SK.* Generally speaking the Yoga School as well as the *Sāṃkhya* School seem not to have the concept 'Highest Self'. Still it would be worth inquiring whether the concept of the Highest Self is absolutely contradictory to the thoughts of both Schools or not. For the word '*paramātman*' is used in the Commentaries (*G., M.*) on *SK.*

42. *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* of Kaṇāda with the Commentary of Candrānanda (ed. by Jambuvijayaji, *Gaekwad's Oriental Series* No. 136) 3.2.13. See my article 'Arguments for the existence of *ātman* in the Vaiśeṣika Philosophy' in *The Annual Reports of The Faculty of Arts and Letters Tohoku University* Vol. 25, 1975.

43. Garbe, R., Pañcaśikha und seine Fragmente (Festgruss an Rudolf von Roth) p. 78, *Die Sāṃkhya-Philosophie* p. 361. Also Monier Monier-Williams' *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* which has '*aṇumātra*, mfn. having the size of an atom' adopts this interpretation.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

stood that the *ātman* is extremely small according to whichever meaning we take. However does it just view the *ātman* as an extremely small object ?

As we have already seen, Vācaspatimiśra (*TV.*) considers '*aṇu*' as 'hard of access'. Because he regards the *ātman* as difficult to recognize, difficult to attain, there is no problem whether its size is extremely small or not. Śaṅkara (*Vv.*) explains '*aṇu*' as *sūkṣma* (suttle, minute). But the *ātman* defined as minute must be limited by the self-awareness. It is not clear whether the *ātman* itself is minute or not. Vijñānabhikṣu (*Yv.*) explains '*aṇumātra*' as '*sūkṣmatama*' (the minutest, subtlest). *Vv.* and *Yv.* interpret '*aṇu*' as '*sūkṣma*'. This '*sūkṣma*' has the meaning 'subtle', 'minute' etc., but it does not merely imply small in form. That is to say, in *SK.* and its Commentaries, the minute does not eliminate the all-pervasive, universal. In other words the primordial matter (*prakṛti*) is considered as follows : "Because of the subtlety, (the primordial matter) is not perceived" (*saukṣmyāt tadanupalabdhir, SK.* 8a), and on the other hand it is said that it is all-pervasive (*vyāpin*) (ad *SK.* 10). *SK.* and its Commentaries (G., M, *Suvarṇasaptati* ad *SK.* 17) also say that the soul (*puruṣa*) is minute (*sūkṣma*), but in the same way it is all-pervasive and omnipresent.[44]

Thus considered from the Commentaries on *YSBh.* the '*ātman* of minute size' of the Fragment does not seem to be limited just to the meaning that its size is minute. That is to say, it would not necessarily deny the all-pervasiveness of the *ātman*. However this is not very clear from *YSBh.* or the Fragment itself.

Even if this Fragment was composed prior to *YSBh.*, it is difficult to date it with certainty. Here I think that a review of the *ātman* theories in the records which antedate *YSBh.* may give some leads concerning the problem in hand. Since it is not possible to examine all of them here, I shall just take up those which seem important.

From old, Śāṇḍilya's teachings state that the *ātman* is 'small like a grain of wheat, a grain of barley, a grain of millet, a kernel of millet; greater than heaven, space, the earth, and all the worlds'.[45] In the Middle Period *Upaniṣads*, also it is stated that the *ātman* is 'smaller than the small, greater than the great', e.g. the *Kaṭha Up.* 2.20.

> "Smaller than the small, greater than the great, the *ātman* is set in the heart of the creature. Freed of sorrow, the unstriving man beholds the greatness of the *ātman* through the grace of the Creator (*dhātuḥ prasādāt*)".

Also in the *Śvetāśvatara Up.* 3.20 it only differs from the latter half of the above as follows :

---

44 See my article 'On the singleness of *puruṣa* in the *Sāṃkhya* Philosophy' published in the *Report of the Institute for Japanese Culture* No. 10, 1974, Tohoku University, Sendai 1974.

45 *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* (ed. by A. Weber, p. 806), 10.6.3, *Chāndogya-Upaniṣad* 3.14.1-4.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

"Smaller than the small, greater than the great, the *ātman* is set in the heart of the creature. Freed of sorrow, he sees it (*ātman*) as actionless, majestic, and the Lord, through the grace of the Creator".

Also in the Middle and Later *Upaniṣads* the *ātman* is regarded as all-pervasive, and going everywhere (*sarvagata*).[46] However in other places, the *ātman* is regarded as minute (*aṇu*).[47] It may be considered that what has been said in them is probably not without connection with what is stated in the P. Fragment 4.

The statements "the clearness of the consciousness....is like space", "the mind is....boundless" which we have seen above in Vyāsa's Commentary would indicate the all-pervasiveness, or omnipresence of the consciousness and mind. As shown above, the sub-commentaries on it interpret it in that way.

Concerning the all-pervasiveness of the mind, *YSBh.* 4.10 says:

"Some think that just as a lamp (which illumines) a jar or a palace, the mind (*citta*) which expands and contracts[48] is only the size and shape of the body, and also in the same way, there are the intermediate state between death and next birth and the corresponding transmigration.[49]

The teacher (*ācārya*)[50] says that only the activity (*vṛtti*) of this all-pervasive (*vibhu*) mind expands and contracts".

Here there appear the two views, that the mind (*citta*) itself expands and contracts, and that it is only the activity (*vrtti*) of this all-pervasive mind which expands and contracts. In the first view, it is stated that the mind only expands or contracts to the size of the body. The sub-commentaries state that this is the view of other school, and the latter is the author's own position.

Yv. says that the first view is the *Sāṃkhya* theory. In *SK.* there is no section discussing the size of the mind or mental organs, but *Sāṃkhya-sūtra* (abbr.

---

46 "I know this undecaying, ancient Self of all, present in everything (*sarvagata*) on account of all-pervasiveness (*vibhutvāt*)" (*Śvetāśvatara-Up.* 3.21).

"Knowing the self (*ātman*) that is the bodiless among bodies, the stable among the unstable, the great, the all-pervasive (*vibhu*), the wise man does not grieve" (*Kaṭha-Up.*2.22).

47 "The minute (subtle) self (*ātman*) is to be known by the mind (*cetas*) in which the senses in five different forms have centred. All the mind (*citta*) of living beings is pervaded by the senses (*prāṇas*). When it (mind) is purified, the self shines forth". (*Muṇḍaka-Up* 3.1.9).

"When, by the extinction of the mind, he sees through self the shining self, minuter than the minute (*aṇor aṇīyāṃsaṃ*), then having seen the self through the self he becomes selfless (*nirātman*)". (*Maitri-Up.* 6.20)

48 *saṅkocavikāsin. KSS.* p. 406, *l.*2 : *saṅkocavikāśin.*

49 *MGOS.* p. 330, 1.1 : *saṃsaraṇañ ca yuktaṃ iti,*
others : *saṃsāraś ca yukta iti.*

50 *MGOS.* p. 330, *l.*2 : *ācāryāḥ,* others : *ācāryaḥ.*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

SS.) v. 69 states "The mental organ (*manas*) is not all-pervasive. Because it is an instrument, or because it is an organ,[51] for example like an axe etc., or like the eye etc." According to Vijñānabhikṣu's *Sāṃkhyapravacanabhāṣya* (ad *SS.* v. 71) the mental organ (*manas*) is "like a jar, is middle-sized, and has parts".

Now according to *TV.* and *Yv.*, the second view is the theory of the *Yoga* School. *TV.* states that they are the words of Svayambhū, and according to *Yv.* the words of Patañjali.

> Concerning the all-pervasiveness of the mind, *TV.* states: "Because the mind (*cetas*) emerges from the self-awareness (*āhaṃkārikatvāt*), the self-awareness (*ahaṃkāra*), like the sphere of the sky, fully pervades the Three Realms (*trailokyavyāpitvāt*), so the mental organ (*manas*) is all-pervasive (*vibhutva*)".

This reference alludes to the *Sāṃkhya* process of evolution which states that the *manas* arises from the *ahaṃkāra* (self-awareness). Nevertheless, it means that because the *ahaṃkāra* is all-pervasive, the *manas* is also all-pervasive. This theory accords with theories held within the *Sāṃkhya* School, though not clearly recognizable in *SK.*

Near the end of Śaṅkara's Commentary on *Brahmasūtra* (abbr. *BS.*) 3.1.1 he says

> "When the all-pervasive (*vyāpin*) organs and the *ātman* attain another body (after death), there is the attainment of activity through the power of action (*karman*) there".

Concerning this Vācaspatimiśra's *Bhāmatī* adds the following explanation:

> "Relating the thought of the *Sāṃkhya*, he says 'the all-pervasive organs' etc. He means that since the organs arise from the *ahaṃkāra* (self-awareness), and since the *ahaṃkāra* pervades throughout the world, the organs are also all-pervasive (*vyāpin*)".[52]

Among the commentaries on *SK*, only the *Yuktidīpikā* (abbr. *Y.*) comments on the first half of *SK.* 28:

> "However, it is because these (*indriyas*, organs) which arise from the self-awareness (*āhaṃkārika*) are all-pervasive (*vyāpakatvāt*). Their activity has the nature of transforming into the image of the object, and it arises without differing from that which has activity".[53]

---

51 The following passage is omitted in the text of Vijñānabhikṣu and Nāgeśa, though Aniruddha and Mahādeva have this passage.

52 The *Brahmasūtra Śāṅkara Bhāṣya* with the Commentaries *Bhāmatī*, *Kalpataru* and *Parimala*, Nirnaya Sāgar Press, Bombay 1938, p. 659.

53 *Yuktidīpikā* (ed. by Ram Chandra Pandeya) p. 103, l.26-27.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

According to the *Sāṃkhya* System, the organs (*indriyas*) include the *manas* (mental organ). There was a theory that together with the *manas* the organs are all-pervasive in a School of the *Sāṃkhya*. But this theory described in *Y.* and the *Bhāmatī* does not coincide with the above descriptions of *SS.* v. 69 and Vijñānabhikṣu and *YSBh.* 4.10.

In the *Vaiśeṣika*[54] and *Nyāya*[55] Schools, the *manas* is not all-pervasive, but minute (*aṇu*). In contrast to this, the *Yoga* School and a School of the *Sāṃkhya* view the *manas* as all-pervasive. For what reason is the *manas* all-pervasive ?

As we saw previously in *YSBh.* (ad *YS.* 1.36), it is said that the clearness of consciousness is like space ', ' the mind (*citta*) is boundless ', in the equipoised state of deep meditation. It seems that this is based upon the fact that in meditation one feels as though the mind becomes limitlessly large, and it penetrates all things. If this was all there was to it, it would be quite understandabale, without any problems.

But however, in the subsequent *YSBh.* 4.10, it has " the activity of the all-pervasive mind ". There is the mind and this is all-pervasive, but the activity o this mind expands and contracts. Here it is not just a matter of a feeling tha the mind becomes expansive. It objectively deals with the mind and considers it to be all-pervasive.

According to *TV.* ' Since the mind (*cetas*) arises from the self-awareness (*ahaṃkāra*), and since the self-awareness penetrates throughout the three realms like space, the *manas* (mental organ) is also all-pervasive '. It seems that the *manas* here, together with the self-awareness, is regarded as all-pervasive throughout the three realms. The self-awareness (*ahaṃkāra*), as the self-consiousness may be considered to be the individual principle (*Sk.* 24), but since it is said to penetrate throughout the three realms, it is possible also to think of it as cosmic.[56] If the *manas* is all-pervasive it is supposed to be cosmic. The cosmic *ahaṃkāra* or *manas* is not diverse things but only one. In connection with the passage quoted in *YSBh.* 4.10 H. Jacobi reads it as a single all-pervasive, consequently cosmic mind (*citta*).[57]

---

54 *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* of Kaṇāda with the Commentary of Candrānanda (ed. by Jambu vijayaji), 7.1.30.

55 *Nyāyasūtra*, 3.2.59.

56 Concerning the cosmic *ahaṃkāra*, see J. A. B. van Buitenen : " Studies in Sāṃkhya (II), Ahaṃkāra ", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 77, 1957, pp. 15-25.

57 Jacobi, Hermann, " Über das ursprüngliche Yogasystem ", *Sitzungs-berichete de Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1930, p. 324. According to his opinion, it is th primitive *Yoga* (Uryoga) that teaches the activity of the all-pervasive mind, and the Uryog is different from the *Yoga* of Patañjali.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Nevertheless it is not stated in *YSBh.* the *manas* (mental organ) is only one. And also it is contrary to our experience of the world to say that the mind, the mental organ, is only one in the world. Though the sense-organs (like eye etc..) are considered to be all-pervasive (according to *Y.* etc.), it is hard for us to think that there is only one eye etc. in the world. We can understand it if we say that the eye sees distant things, and the mind can think of distant things. In connection with *YSBh.* 4.10, *Vv.* has " It is also reasonable that the *yogins* are omniscient without the sense-organs, and (the sense organs and the mind) are all-pervasive ". Since this says that the *yogin* knows all things by supernatural powers, without using the sense-organs, it considers the mind to be all-pervasive.

Concerning the same section, *Yv.* has " Otherwise (if the mind is not all-pervasive, and it) is localized, (the mind as) the qualification of God (*iśvara-upādhi*) becomes also limited, hence it would contradict revelation, tradition, and reason which say that God is all-pervasive ". It can be said that he considers it to be the mind of God which pervades throughout the universe. Here it also seems that only one mind is postulated.

In all events, it can be thought that the *P.* Fragment 4 was quoted in *YSBh.* 1.36, supposing the cosmic mind. What connection has the cosmic mind with the *ātman* ? Even if it would not be amiss to say that the subjective *ātman* is minute, in contrast to the cosmic mind, in this case, it seems appropriate not to eliminate the notion that the *ātman* is at the same time all-pervasive.

IV The theory concerning the size of the ātman in the Brahma-sūtra and its explanations :

R. Garbe proposes that the all-pervasiveness of the soul in the *Sāṃkhya* School, after Īśvarakṛṣṇa, is the influence of the *Vedānta* Philosophy. Let us investigate this theory by considering the *ātman*, in particular the individual soul *jīva, jīvātman*), is pervasive or minute, in the *Vedānta* School. To this end we should examine the teaching of the basic text of the *Vedānta*, the *Brahmasūtra*, together with the explanations of its various Commentaries. *BS.* 2.3.19-32 [58] discusses the size of the *ātman*, and it seems to conclude that it is minute. It says :

" (Because the Scripture declares that the *jīva*) leaves (the body), goes about (to the other world), and returns (to this world), (therefore it is of minute size) " (*BS.* 2.3.19).

The above explanations have been supplied according to Śaṅkara's comments, but according to Rāmānuja's Commentary :

" (The *ātman* is not all-pervading, but rather it is minute. Why ? Because the Scripture declares that the *ātman*) leaves (the body), goes

58 According to Rāmānuja, the number of the *sūtra* is 2.3.20.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

about (to the other world), and returns (to this world). (If the *ātman* were all-pervasive, it could not leave the body and so on)".

In principle we can say that it is the same as Śaṅkara's explanation, and Bhāskara's explanation is more or less the same.[59] The basis here is that in the divine revelations, the *Upaniṣads*, it is taught that the individual soul leaves the body on its death,[60] goes to the moon,[61] and then again returns to this world.[62] And the fact that this leaving the body and so on is possible must be because the soul is minute. An all-pervasive, omnipresent one (*sarvagata, vibhu*) could not leave the body and return. The all-pervasive or omnipresent seems here to be pervading all things, and not possible to leave the body and transmigrate. The meaning of the above *sūtra* and the unanimous opinion of the Commentators is that the *ātman*, the individual soul (*jīva*) is not all-pervasive in that way, but minute.

But there is a problem concerning this. It is also taught in the scripture that the *ātman* is large, and based upon this, there is the assertion that the *ātma* is not minute, but all-pervasive. On this, *BS.* 2.3.21 says :

> "If (some say that the *ātman*) is not minute, because it is declared in the Scripture that this is not (minute). This is not so, because the subject (in these passages of the Scripture) is with reference to the other (i.e. the Highest Self)."

This exegesis is based upon the generally unanimous explanations of Śaṅkara and the other two commentators. The above 'scripture' indicates, according to Śaṅkara,

---

59 According to Bhāskara, the text of the *sūtra* is '*kasmāt utkrāntigatyāgatīnām*' and means :

"(The individual soul is of minute size) Why? (Because the Scripture declares that the individual soul) leaves (the body), goes about (to the other world), and returns (to this world). Those three are not possible for that which is all-pervasive.)"

60 "(When a man is dying, and) when it (the individual self, *prāṇa*, *prajñātman*,) departs from this body, it departs together with all these (i.e. the senses and their objects)" (*Kauṣītaki Up.* 3.3, that is quoted by Śaṅkara).

"(When a man is dying) by that light (of the point of his heart) the *ātman* (individual self) departs either through the eye or through the head or through other parts of the body" (*Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Up.* 4.4.2, which is quoted by Rāmānuja.)

"(When a man is dying——) when it (the *ātman*) thus departs, the *prāṇa* (breath, life) departs after it". (*Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Up.* 4.4.2, which is quoted by Bhāskara.)

61 "Those who, verily, depart from this world, they all, in truth, go to the moon" (*Kauṣītaki-Up.* 1.2, which is quoted by Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Bhāskara.).

62 "He (the individual self) comes again from that world for (doing) work (*karman*)" (*Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Up.* 4.4.6, which is quoted by Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja).

"Having dwelt there (in the moon) as long as there is residue (of good works), they return again by that course by which they came". (*Chāndogya-Up.* 5.10.5, which is quoted by Bhāskara).

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

"Truly this great unborn self (*ātman*) consists of cognition among the senses (*prāṇas*)". (*Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Up.* 4.4.22) etc.[63]

Bhāskara and Rāmānuja also quote the above passage. As explained above, *BS.* views the individual soul, *ātman*, as minute, but on the contrary, the Highest Self (*paramātman*,[64] *para ātman*,[65] *prājña*[66]) as extremely large. In any case, it establishes two kinds of *ātman*, the one minute, the other immense. There were various debates concerning the relations between this individual self and the Highest Self, within the *Vedānta* School, and according to its explanation, this School divided into several sects, but with regards to the explanation of the above *sūtra*, there is hardly any difference between the three commentators.

BS. continues, and debates the truth of the minuteness of the *ātman*, and solves difficulties that arise if it is maintained that the *ātman* is minute. The difficulty is that the impressions do not arise throughout the whole body, if this *ātman* is minute.[67] In reply to this it compares the *ātman* to a grain of aromatic sandal wood which even touching a single part of the body gives rise to a pleasant feeling throughout the body (*BS.* 2.3.23).[68] And since it also pervades the whole body by spirituality (*caitanya*)[69] which is an attribute of the *ātman*, there are impressions throughout the whole body (*BS.* 2.3.25).[70] Also

63 In addition to this Śaṅkara quotes :

"Like space, (he is) all-pervading (*sarvagata*), and eternal".

"Truth, knowledge and infinite is Brahman". (*Taittirīya-Up.* 2.1.1.).

64 According to Bhāskara.

65 According to Śaṅkara.

66 According to Rāmānuja.

67 This interpretation is according to Rāmānuja. The understanding of other Commentators is also about the same.

68 According to Śaṅkara the meaning of this *sūtra* is as follows :

"(If the *ātman* were minute, because of its being confined to only one portion of the body, perception by it all over the body would be contradictory. To this the author of *BS.* replies : There is) no contradiction, just as (a drop of) sandalwood (paste, though it is in contact with only a portion of the body, creates a refreshingly pleasurable sensation pervading the whole body, even so the *ātman* may well be able to have perception pervading the whole body, even though confined to only one portion of the body)".

Also Bhāskara and Rāmānuja nearly agree to this interpretation.

69 Śaṅkara and Bhāskara use the word '*caitanyaguṇa*' (ad *BS.* 2.3. 25), but Rāmānuja uses '*jñāna*' (ad *BS.* 2.3.26.).

70 According to Śaṅkara this *sūtra* means :

"Or because of the attribute (of spirituality pervading the whole body, even though the individual soul, the *jīva*, is minute, its action of pervading the whole body is not contradicted. It is) just as (it is experienced in) the ordinary world, (viz. that the light of gems and lamps etc. which occupy only a part of the inner apartment of a house, fully pervades the whole inner apartment)".

According to Bhāskara it means :

"Or because of the attribute (of spirituality pervading the whole body, there is perception all over the body,) just as the light (pervades and illumines the whole house)".

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

it proposes that this attribute differs from the basis of the attribute (*BS.* 2.3.26-28).[71] There are almost no differences of opinion between the commentators on these points.

However their explanations part concerning the following *sūtra* (2.3.29). It runs :

" *tadguṇasāratvāt tu tadvyapadeśaḥ prājñavat* "

without variation among the Commentaries.

According to Rāmānuja it means :

" However since it has this attribute (of cognition) as its essence, that (the *ātman* has cognition) is indicated. (For example,) like the intelligent (self, whose attribute, essence, is joy, so the intelligent self is indicated by the word 'joy') ".

According to Rāmānuja it means :

" Or because (the *ātman* is pervading the whole body with its own) attribute (i.e. consciousness, *jñāna*). Just as the light (of gems, the sun etc., residing only in one region is not seen as pervading only one region; similarly the consciousness, *jñāna*, of the *ātman* residing in the heart is there pervading the whole body) ".

71 According to Śaṅkara the meaning of these *sūtras* is as follows :

" Just as (even though) odour (is but an attribute, it exists apart from the substance to which such attribute of odour belongs, even so, though the individual soul is minute, its attribute of spirituality may exist) apart from (it) ". (*BS.* 2.3.26).

" And thus (Scripture also) declares (that the *ātman* has the heart as its abode, and that is of minute size, also further declare that the *ātman* pervades the whole body by means of its attribute of spirituality) ". (*BS.* 2.3.27).

" Because (Scripture) declares (that the *ātman* and intelligence are) separate (as being the agent and the instrument of action, it is understood that the individual soul pervades the whole body by its attribute of spirituality) ". (*BS.* 2.3.28).

According to Bhāskara they mean :

" (The spirituality as an attribute is) different (from a part of the *ātman* as a substance having the attribute,) just as odour (is perceived separately, and it is not conceivable that a substance which has odour as its attribute enters the nostrils) ". (*BS.* 2.3.26).

" And thus (Scripture) declares (that the *ātman* pervades the body by means of its attribute of spirituality) ". (*BS.* 2.3.27)

" Because (Scripture) declares (that the individual soul and the cognition are) separate " (*BS.* 2.3.28)

According to Rāmānuja they mean :

" Just as odour (which is perceived as the attribute of the earth is) different (from that, and thus (that knowledge which is apprehended as the attribute of the knower, in the form– I know——is proved to be separate from the *ātman*), and so declares (the Scripture) " (*BS.* 2.3.27).

" Because it is declared (in the very words of the Scripture that the cognition, *vijñāna*, is separate (from the cognizing subject, *vijñātṛ*) ". (*BS.* 2.3.28)

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

According to Bhāskara it means :

"However, since it has this attribute (of the consciousness) as its essence, that (the fact that the individual self in transmigration is minute) is indicated. (For example,) like the intelligent (self when supposed to abide in the heart is minute, but its original character is superlative)".

There he indicates that the *ātman* is originally not minute but immense. And he also says here :

"We understand that the *ātman* in the state of transmigration is minute."

But on this, Śaṅkara denies the previous theory that the *ātman* is minute and asserts that the *ātman* is all-pervasive (*vibhutva*). He writes as follows :

"The word 'However' eliminates the (previous) assertion. It is not that the *ātman* is minute (*aṇu*). For since (the *ātman*'s) genesis is not taught (in the Scripture), while the entry of the Supreme Brahman (as the *ātman* into the creatures) is taught, and also since the identity (of the *Brahman* with the *ātman*) is propounded, the individual soul is said also to be the Supreme *Brahman* (*para brahman*). If the individual soul is also the Supreme *Brahman*, then it should be just of the same (size) as the Supreme *Brahman* (no matter what size that is). And it is taught that the Supreme *Brahman* is all-pervasive (*vibhutva*). Hence the individual soul (*jīva*) is all-pervasive (*vibhu*). In the same way (as it is taught, for instance, that) 'Truly this great unborn self (*ātman*) consists of cognition among the senses (*prāṇas*)' (*Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Up.* 4.4.22) so these kinds of declarations about the all-pervasiveness of the individual soul are taught in the divine revelation, and also in the tradition, and they are established.

[72]Also if the individual soul were minute, the sensation (or pain) running throughout the whole body could not be produced. If (some say that there is such a sensation) because it has a cohesive connection with the skin, then it is not so. (If it were because it has a cohesive connection with the skin), then even pricked with a thorn, the pain would result throughout the whole body. For the union of skin and the thorn is throughout the entire skin. Because the skin covers the whole body. However a man who is pricked by a thorn (in the foot) feels pain only in the sole of the foot (pricked by a thorn).

[73]Also if (the individual soul) were minute, there could not be the all-pervasiveness of (its) attribute. For the attribute (*guṇa*) is a part of the substance having the attribute (*guṇin*). For also even the being an attribute itself would be lost, not having its foundation in the substance having the attribute.

72 Here follows the refutation to *BS.* 2.3.23.
73 Here follows the refutation to *BS.* 2.3.25.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Also it has been explained that the light of lamp is another substance (and not an attribute).

[74]Since it is acknowledged that odour is also an attribute, it has a basis, so it can diffuse. For if not so, it would result in loss of being an attribute. In the same way, the Sage Dvaipāyana says :

'When they cognise odour in water, some unwise may say (that odour is in water, but) one should know that the odour which is only in earth is mixed with water and wind'. (*Mahābhārata* 12.8518)[75]. Also if the spirituality (*caitanya*) of the individual soul would pervade the whole body, the individual soul would not be minute. Because its substance (*svarūpa*) is also spirituality. It is just like the heat and light of fire. There is no division of the attribute and the substance having the attribute here.

[76]Also it is refuted that (the individual soul) is of the size of the body (*śarīraparimāṇatva*). Therefore as the only remaining alternative (the conclusion is that) the individual soul is all-pervasive (*vibhu*).

Why in that case is there the declaration (in the scriptures) that it is minute and so on ? (the author of *BS.*) says here 'However since it has its attribute as its essence, that is indicated'. 'Its attributes' are the attributes of its consciousnes (*buddhi*), and its (various) attributes—desire, hatred, pleasure, pain, etc.—arise as its 'essence', its principal characteristics, as long as the soul (*ātman*) transmigrates. That (*ātman*) has its attribute as essence, and its state of being is that '(it has) its attribute as its essence'. For if there are not the attributes of the consciousness, there could be no transmigratory existence for the mere pure *ātman*. For, having the characteristics of agent and enjoyer etc., based upon the superimposition of the quality of the qualification i.e. the consciousness (*buddhyupādhidharmādhyāsanimitta*), there (happens to) be the transmigratory existence for the *ātman* which is neither agent nor enjoyer, nor transmigrates, and exists ever liberated (*nityamukta*). For that reason, since 'it has its attribute as its essence', its (the *ātman*'s) size 'is indicated' by the size of the consciousness.

[77]Also the departure etc. of the (*ātman*) are indicated by the departure etc. of its (consciousness), but not (that the *ātman* departs) itself.

[78]Also in the same way, (we have the scriptural passage) 'The individual soul is to be known as one part of the hundredth part of the tip of a hair divide

---

74 Here follows the refutation to *BS.* 2.3.26.

75 The *Mahābhārata*, for the first time critically edited by Sukthankar, V. S.; Belvalkar S. K., Vol. 15, p. 1255 right 1. 1-2 (= XII,224.40).

76 *BS.* 2.2.34-36 (criticism on the Jaina theory of the soul).

77 Here follows the refutation to *BS.* 2.3.19.

78 Here follows the refutation to *BS.* 2.3.22.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

a hundredfold, yet it is to be infinite' (*Śvetāśvatara-Up.* 5.9) which after stating that the individual soul is minute, declares aslo it ought to be infinite. That fact may be admittable in this way: If the minuteness of the individual soul is metaphorical (*aupacārika*), and its infinity is ultimately true. Because it would be incorrect for both to be the original meaning (*mukhya*). Also it cannot be recognized that the infinity is metaphorical. For in all the *Upaniṣads* it is intended to teach that the *Brahman* is the *ātman* (*brahmātmabhāva*).

In the same way, concerning other measurement (*unmāna*), saying :

'With the attribute of the consciousness and the attribute of the *ātman*, the lower one also appears to be of the size of the point of a goad' (*Śvetāśvatara-Up.* 5.8), it teaches that it is only of the size of the tip of a goad, only through its union with the attribute of the consciousness, but the *ātman* itself is not so.

'This minute *ātman* is to be known by the mind' (*Muṇḍaka-Up.* 3.1.9). Here also it is not taught that the individual soul is of minute size. The Highest Self (*para ātman*) is alluded to as that which cannot be grasped by vision etc., and which should be understood by lucidity of knowledge (*jñānaprasāda*).[79] Also since it is not appropriate that the individual soul is originally minute in size. Therefore when it is said that this *ātman* minute, it should be regarded as meaning that it is difficult to know, or else as meaning its qualifications.

[80] In the same way, even in the teachings of their distinction (of the *ātman* and intelligence) such as 'Having obtained control of the body by the intelligence (*prajñā*)' (*Kauṣītaki-Up.* 3.6), it should be understood as 'only by the consciousness as (its) being qualification having the individual soul obtained control of the body', or else as only a (metaphorical) indication, like talking of the body of the stone image and so on. For it is said that there is not separation here of the attribute and the substance having the attribute.

[81] Also the statement that the *ātman* abides in the heart is because the consciousness makes its abode there.

[82] In the same way departure (of the *ātman*) etc. also indicates its dependence upon qualification (*upādhyāyattatā*).

'In whose departure shall I be departing? In whose staying shall I stay?' (*Praśna-Up.* 6.3).

'He created vital breath (*prāṇa*)' (*Praśna-Up.* 6.4).

---

79 Cf. *Muṇḍaka-Up.* 3.1.8. The translation of '*jñāna-prasāda*' is based on G. Thibaut's 'the serene light of knowledge', though it is interpreted as 'die Gnade des Wissens' (P. Deussen) or 'knowledge and its grace' (Apte, V. M.).

80 Here follows the refutation to *BS.* 2.3.28.

81 Here follows the refutation to *BS.* 2.3.24.

82. Here follows the refutation to *BS.* 2.3.19.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

For it is recognized that if there is no departure (of the *ātman*), neither going about nor return is recognized. For that which has not left the body will not go about, nor return. In this way since it has such an attribute of the qualification as its essence, there is an indication that the individual soul is minute and so on. (For example) ' like the intelligent ' (*ātman*). For example, since the intelligent (*ātman* i.e.) the Highest Self (*prājña paramātman*) has the attribute of the qualification as its essence, in the meditations (upon the *Brahman* qualified) by attributes (*saguṇa upāsanā*), it is indicated that it is smaller etc., viz. ' (The *ātman*) is smaller than a grain of rice, or smaller than a grain of wheat ' (*Chāndogya-Up.* 3.14.3), ' (*Brahman* = *ātman*) consists of the mental organ (*manas*), its body is vital breath, contains all odours, contains all tastes, desires truth, and reflects on the truth ' (*Chāndogya-Up.* 3.14.2). And so on. (The individual soul is) the same as that ".

According to the above explanation of Śaṅkara, the *sūtra* itself should be understood thus :

> " However (the *ātman* is not minute, since the individual soul, the *jīva*, is also the Highest *Brahman*, the individual soul is all-pervasive. Since it has the attribute (of its consciousness) as its essence, that (the individual soul is minute) is indicated. (For example) like the intelligent (self is shown to be minuter, since the Highest Self has the attribute of qualification as its essence, in the meditations upon the *Brahman* qualified by attributes) ".

This partly agrees also with Bhāskara's explanation. But Bhāskara does not deny the assertions of the previous *sūtras*. In contrast to this, Śaṅkara refutes the assertions of the previous *sūtras* (*BS.* 2.3.19-28), and denies all of them. This fact is indicated point by point in the notes for the previous passage.

According to Śaṅkara's theory, one can say that the *ātman* as the individual soul, the *jīva*, being equal to the Highest Self (*para ātman*, *paramātman*) which is the world soul, is all-pervasive and not minute, but based upon the superimposition of the attribute of the qualification, i.e. consciousness, it undergoes transmigration, and it is minute through the size of the consciousness. Śaṅkara understands the words of the scriptures on the minuteness of the *ātman* as either that the ' minuteness ' is a metaphorical expression or as ' minute ' meaning difficult to know, meaning a qualification (*upādhi*).

In this way Śaṅkara asserts the all-pervasiveness of the *ātman*, but in contrast to this Rāmānuja concludes with the fact that it is minute. Introducing the *sūtra* 2.3.32, he says :

> " (The author of *BS.*) relates the objection against the all-pervasiveness (*sarvagatatva*) of that (*ātman*) in the assertion that knowledge is *ātman* (*jñānātmavāda*) ".

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

and next he explains the meaning of the *sūtra* in question :

"(The *ātman* is minute. For if it were not so (that is, with the view that the *ātman* is all-pervasive and the view that it is only knowledge), perception and non-perception would always result, or else one of them would be restricted. (That is, there would always be either perception alone, or non-perception alone. Hence it is not correct that the *ātman* is all-pervasive)".

However Śaṅkara [83] and Bhāskara [84] understand a completely different sense.

According to the above, it is the special feature of Śaṅkara's theory that he *ātman* is all-pervasive, and against that, Rāmānuja states that the *ātman* is not all-pervasive but is minute.

Is that the original sense of *BS.* ? It is almost impossible to draw out the direct meaning from the extreme ellipsis of its text. Consequently we have to rely upon the explanations of the comentators, but even among them, there are many differences of opinion. This is so, but as we have seen previously in the explanations of the meaning of *BS.* 2.3.19-20, that the *ātman* or *jīva* is minute, finds general agreement among the commentators. Also concerning *BS.* 2.3.21, there is general agreement among them in recognizing its sense as that though the scriptures say the *ātman* is immense, but since this refers to the Highest Self, that the *ātman* as the individual self is minute, is justifiable.

In consideration of this, *BS.* probably recognized that the *ātman* as individual self (soul) is minute, and that the Highest Self is all-pervasive.

V. Conclusion

As we have seen above, it is not held absolutely in the *Vedānta* School that the *ātman* is all-pervasive, but it is rather Śaṅkara's theory that it is all-pervasive, extremely great. Also it has "the *ātman* of minute size" in the Pañcaśikha fragment 4 quoted in *YSBh.* 1.36, as we have seen above, we can consider that this does not necessarily exclude its all-pervasiveness. From this point it is

83 According to Śaṅkara this *sūtra* means :

"(The internal organ (*antaḥkaraṇa*) which constitutes the qualification (*upādhi*) of *ātman* is called in different places as *manas* (mind), *buddhi* (consciousness), *vijñāna* (cognition), or *citta* (thought). The internal organ of this type must necessarily be understood to exist, because) otherwise there would result either perpetual perception or perpetual non-perception. Or else (it should be understood that there is) an impediment (to the energy either of the *ātman* or of the sense-organ".

84 According to Bhāskara it means :

"(The internal organ which constitutes the qualification of the *ātman* must be understood to exist, because) otherwise (when the *ātman* is clsoe to the sense-organ and the object) there would result either perpetual perception or perpetual non-perception. Or else (it must be assumed that there is a limitation either of the sense-organ or of the *ātman*)".

Bhāskara's understanding of this *sūtra* is near to that of Śaṅkara.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

difficult to conclusively state that the all-pervasiveness of the soul (*puruṣa*) in the *Sāṃkhya* Philosophy (in *SK.* and thereafter) is the influence of the *Vedānta* Philosophy. In would also unreasonable historically for Śaṅkara to have influenced *SK.*

It is true, as is pointed out, that the *Vedānta* School has a long history before Śaṅkara and that there was also the thought which heralded the non-dualism (*advaita*) of Śaṅkara.[85] But it is not easy to trace the non-dualistic thought back to the period prior to *SK.* It is only after the *Sāṃkhya* that the *Vedānta* School grew powerful, not before. Even within it, it cannot be thought that the non-dualistic thought was powerful from old.

It is the *Vedānta* School which developed speculations concerning the Highest Self and the individual self, and several sects arose due to the exegesis of the Highest Self and the individual self. On the other hand, speculation about the Highest Self cannot be clearly discerned in the *Sāṃkhya* School, however when it is said that soul is all-pervasive and it is one (*G.*, *M.*, *Y.*, *J.* and *Suvarṇasaptati*), it can be thought not to be limited to the individual self but as approaching the Highest Self. Also the Commentaries on *SK.* (*G.*, *M.*) use the word the Highest Self (*paramātman*).

However on the other hand, the Highest Self of the *Vedānta* Philosophy the *Brahman*, which, is also the cause of the world (*BS.* 1.1.2). In the *Sāṃkhya* the cause of the world is the *prakṛti* (primordial matter, Nature), not th *puruṣa* (soul). In fact, the Commentaries (*G.*, *M.*, *Suvarṇasaptati*) give th word '*brahman*' as a synonym of '*prakṛti*'.

In is the *Upaniṣads*, the *Vedānta*, which the *Vedānta* School held a the basis of the thought. *BS.* takes up those portions of the old *Upaniṣads* which allows Sāṃkhyaistic explanation, and expends energies attacking the Sāṃkhyaistic explanations. The old *Upaniṣads* were established before *SK.* and were respected as divine revelation (*śruti*). Also the Sāṃkhyaistic thought is to be noticed after the *Kaṭha-Upaniṣad.* It is necessary here to trace back a tradition of thought from the *Upaniṣads*, and also to reconsider their connection with the Sāṃkhya Philosophy. The all-pervasivenss of the *ātman* is mentioned fron the old *Upaniṣads.* We have touched some of them in the preceding pages o the present paper. Their detailed considerations will be presented in a forthcon ing paper.

---

85 Cf. Hajime Nakamura : *Kotoba no keijijogaku*, Tokyo 1956, p. 425. Bhāvaviv referred to the theory that the individual self is identical with the Highest Self. Also the th chapter of the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* states that the Highest Self and the individual self are identi as for instance the immense space and the space within a jar are identical. The same exam is refered to by Bhāvaviveka. These findings are historically after *BS.*, and perhaps not p to *SK.* Concerning this Bhāvaviveka knew *SK*, in his *Prajñāpradīpa* and *Tarkajvālā.*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Abbreviations

BS. = Brahma-sūtra
C. = Nārāyaṇatīrtha's Sāṃkhya-candrikā
G. = Gauḍapāda-bhāṣya
J. = Śaṅkara's Jayamaṅgalā
KSS. = Kashi Sankrit Series
M. = Māṭharavṛtti
MGOS. = Madras Government Oriental Series
P. = Pañcaśikha
SK. = Sāṃkhya-kārikā
SS. = Sāṃkhya-sūtra
TV. = Vācaspatimiśra's Tattvavaiśāradī
U. = Upaniṣad
= Vācaspatimiśra's Sāṃkhya-tattvakaumudī
V. = Śaṅkara's Yogasūtrabhāṣya-vivaraṇa (MGOS. No. XCIV)
Y. = Yuktidīpikā (ed. by Ram Chandra Pandeya, Delhi 1967)
YS. = Yoga-sūtra
YSBh. = Yogasūtra-bhāṣya
Yv. = Vijñānabhikṣu's Yoga-vārttika

———

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

ĀRUṆI OF SVAPNAVĀSAVADATTAṀ OF BHĀSA— A REAPPRAISAL[1]

By

SUDARSHAN KUMAR SHARMA, Bhatinda (Panjab)

To separate history from legend promiscuous throughout the literature in Sanskrit becomes a nagging riddle for the sober critic. Most of the writers in Sanskrit literature, not to speak of the field of *Kāvya* and *Nāṭaka*, the *Gadya Kāvya*, even in the field of historical *Kāvya* have bungled with the historicity of the political events in a chronological sequence. This bungling renders the confusion worse confounded when the sequence of thought in point of historic facts referring to both the character and incident are commingled with fiction fostered by the flights of fancy that marks the sumum-bonum of art in poetry.

Similar is the case with the play of Bhāsa *Svapnavāsavadattam* in which 'Āruṇi[2] playing the prominent role of a formidable foe germinating the very seed of the plots finds no parallel name in ancient Indian Hitsory to ensure a place in the lineage of the Scions of rulers of the contemporary epoch—

The theme of *Svapnavāsavadattam* is primarily motivated to ensure the recovery of the lost portions of the kingdom wrested by Āruṇi by taking undue advantage of the weakness of Udayana who thoroughly engrossed in his dalliance with Vāsavadattā lost the incentive against the formidable alliance of the enemies combined in a federation. As apparent from the sequence of happenings delineated by the poet, Darśaka, the King of Magadha was a formidable entity aspiring for the escalation of the territorial areas corroborated by the comparative study of contemporary history of the period of the Mahā-Janapadas i.e. the Sixth Century B. C., he must have rendered succour to Ārnṇi under some peaceful-Camouflage. Yaugandharāyaṇa, the astute politician deemed it worthwhile to dissociate Darśaka from the alliance of Āruṇi so as to strike the latter with the help of the former with a redoubled force and wrest the lost kingdom from that treacherous enemy. The matrimonial alliance with Darśaka by having Padmāvatī as the alternate spouse for Udayana by the ruse of the '*Lāvāṇaka grāmadāha*' was the be-

---

1 A paper read at the 28th A.I.O.C. held at Karnataka University, Dharwar-3, from Nov. 10 to 12, 1976.

2 *Kañcukīyaḥ-Jayatvāryaputraḥ asmākam mahārājo Darśako bhavantamāha. Eṣa khalu bhavato' mātyo Ṛumaṇvān mahatābalasamudayenopayātaḥ khalvāruṇimabhi-ghātayituṁ. ajjamidānīṁ*

Upetya nāgendraturaṅgatīrṇe tamāruṇiṁ dāruṇakarmadakṣaṁ
Vitīrṇabāṇograturaṅgabhaṅge mahārṇavābhe yudhi nāśayāmi

Kale, M. R., *Svapnavāsavadattam*, Act V, p. 110 and Verse 13.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

neans to ensure his sympathies resulting in the schism in the secret overtures of he two. The footnote 2 above makes it manifest that it was Darśaka who espatched[3] Rumaṇvān with a mighty force to chastise Āruṇi and it is he who nforms Udayana that his enemies had been scared away and his subjects had een given indications to gain confidence and a rear-guard action to the Van-uard action of his forces had been duly maintained and all the arrangements to heckmate the progress of the enemy had been made. The river Gaṅgā (*Tri-athagā*) had been crossed by the forces and the lost territories of the Vatsa anapada had been retained. The King i.e. Udayana exhorted by this alliance nd rear-guard action himself takes courage to chastise Āruṇi and kill him in ttle having approached him personally when left alone by the stratagems of the olitical alliance. Āruṇi has been described as '*Dāruṇakarmadakṣa*' i.e. skilled perpetrating heinous crimes. Intending to destroy Āruṇi Udayana might have lled him. This is the implication.

The theme, therefore, brings to the fore the following few facts :

1. Udayana was the King of Vatsa having Kauśāmbī for its capital (modern Kosam at a distance of 30 miles from modern Allahabad).
2. Darśaka was a powerful King of Magadha whose political alliance through a matrimonial alliance was a deciding factor in scaring away the enemies of Udayana co-ordinating with Āruṇi in the latter's onslaught.
3. Mahāsena alias Pradyota was a King of Ujjayinī (Avanti) and was the father-in-law of Udayana having Vāsavadatta his daughter, as his wife.[4]
4. Darśaka was negotiating terms with Mahāsena for the hand of his sister Padmāvatī for Gopālaka[5], his son, the elder one to Pālaka.[6]

---

3 Tripathi, R. S., *History of Ancient India*, Second ed., 1960, p. 83 and p. 89 Kosam the Jumna, to the south of Allahabad.

4-6 *Tāpasī-Bhadre ! imān tāvad Bhadra-mukhasya bhaginikām Kaścid rājā na varayati. Ceṭī-asti rājā Pradyoto nāma. sa dārakasya kāraṇād dūtasampātam karoti.*

Gupta, D. K., *SVD*, Messrs Meharchand Lacchman Das, Darya Ganj, Delhi, 1975, Act I, 4 and

Vāsavadattā-Eṣāsmi tūṣṇīkā bhaviṣyanmahāsenavadhu.

Padmāvatī — Ka eṣa Mahāseno nāma.

Vāsavadattā-astyujjayinīyo rājā Pradyoto nāma tasya balaparimāṇanirvṛttam nāmadheyam hāsena iti.

, Act. II, P. 36.

Dhātri—āha bhaṭṭinī-Uparatā Vāsavadattā. Mama vā Mahāsenasya vā yādṛśau Gopālaka-kau etc. ,Act IV, P. 114.

Ibid., as also

Sharma, S. K., *Pratijñā- Yaugandharāyaṇa*, Messrs Motilal Banarsi Dass, Delhi, -7 First 1965, Act II. 13, P. 90.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

5. Āruṇi was a King who was a sworn enemy of Udayana and had confederation of allies at his disposal.

6. Āruṇi must have had some affinity for Darśaka or else how could Yauagandharāyaṇa seek alliance of Darśaka to uproot Āruṇi.

7. Darśaka gave up the idea of marrying Padmāvatī with the son of Mahāsena after Vāsavadattā had been declared dead like Mahāsena who formerly gave up his idea of marrying Vāsavadattā with Sañjaya when Udayana had been caught alive by Sālaṅkāyana, who[7] was most probably the king of Kāśī whose Upādhyāya Jaivanti had arrived for the hand of Vāsavadattā[8] in favour of his master.

8. Āruṇi was killed by Udayana after having been intended to do so aided by the reinforcements and alliances of Darśaka.

9. Mahāsena was not displeased over the failure of matrimonial alliance with Darśaka and was pleased rather to see Padmāvatī become a wife of Vāsavadattā whom at the outset he thought, was consumed by the fire at Lāvāṇaka.

10. Mahāsena was pleased over the tactics of Yauganadharāyaṇa by which he was himself duped likewise earlier.[9] With a view to identify Āruṇi we shall have to adopt the method of comparative logic understanding the historicity of other incidents connected with campaign of Āruṇi.

According to Dr. D. K. Gupta[10], the parent source of the theme *Svapnavāsavadattam* is historical. Udayana Pradyota and Darśaka are the persons well known in history. Vāsavadattā and some other characters have also been taken from history in all probability. But it is difficult to say if Bhāsa has borrowed his theme straightway from history or from *Purāṇa*. It appears that in the times of Udayana and others (6th Cent-B.C.) the Udayana legend can entertain within its fold some aspects of the popular tale and consequently the tale or the legend assumed the form of a fiction and subsequently this legend became part and parcel of the popular tale literature.

---

7 Kale, M. R., *Mālatīmādhava*, II, 57

Yacca kila Kauśikī Śakuntalā Duṣyantamapsarā

Urvaśi Pūruravasaṁ cakame ityākhyānavida ācakṣate vāsavadattā ca sañjayāya rājñe dattamātmānam Udayanāya prāyacchaditi.

8 Sharma, S. K., *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa*, Act II, p. 58.

9 Theme of *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa*.

10 *Svapnavāsavadattam*, Introduction, P. XXV.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

According to Dr. Gupta[11] in the Sanskrit redactions of the *Bṛhatkathā* ahāsena is the king of Avanti and Pradyota that of Magadha.[12] Whereas hāsa refers to the King of Ujjayinī as Pradyota having Mahāsena as his title. e takes Darśaka as the king of Magadha having Padmāvatī as his sister. uṇāḍhya (KSS. of Somadeva) takes Padmāvatī as the daughter of Pradyota. ruṇi as the usurper of the territory of Udayana is conspicuous by his absence *Bṛatkathā*[13]. Apart from this *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa*, II-13 referring to opālaka and Pālaka, *Bṛhatkathā* (KSS. of Somadeva) referring to Naravāhanadatta and Avantivardhana as sons of Udayana and Pālaka respectively in mbakas IV and XVI respectively (*Astyujjayinyāṁ nṛpatiḥ Pālnkasaṁjñakaḥ, umārastasya putrobhūt Sunāmāvaktivardhanaḥ=KSS*, XVI. 2.13, p. 529). Śūdraka, ferring to Āryaka as the son of Gopālaka in his *Mṛcchakaṭika*[14] and referring e wise to the act of *Yaugandharāyaṇa* inciting his populace for the release of dayana (obviously from the boundage of Mahāsena)[15] corroborated by Bāṇa ferring to—

> " *nāgavanavihāraśīlaṁ ca māyāmātaṅgāṅgāt*
> *nirgatāḥ Mahāsenasainikāḥ Vatsapatiṁ nyayaṁsiṣuṇ*[16] "
>
> " *Mahākālamahe ca mahāmāṁsavikraya-vādavātūlaṁ Vetālaḥ*
> *Tālajaṅgho jaghāna jaghanyajaṁ Pradyotasya*
> *Pauṇa-kiṁ Kumāraṁ Kumārasenaṁ* "[17]

uding thereby to the capture alive of the king of the Vatsas at the hands of e army men of Mahāsena issued out of the body of the Sham Tusker (the cident of *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa*) and the death of Kumārasena, son of ahāsena at the hands of Vampire Tālajaṅgha all make this point clear that ahāsena Pradyota, Darśaka Udayana, Naravāhanadatta, Gopālaka, Pālaka, yaka, Avantivardhana, Kumārasena, Yaugandharāyaṇa, Vāsavadattā, Rumyān were all historical personages.

---

11 *Ibid.*

12 *So'pi Caṇḍamahāsena Ujjayinyāmacintayat.—Kathā-Saritsāgara*, II-37, 32, Texted by srs Motilal Banarsi Dass, 1970.
Paripanthī ca tatraikaḥ Pradyoto Magadheśvaraḥ,
Ibid., IV, 1.19, P. 48.

13 Gupta, D. K., Introduction, P. CCVI.

14 *Rāṣṭriyaḥ Samājñāpayati-Eṣaḥ Khalvāryako Gopāladārako rājā bhaviṣyatiti Siddhāpratyayā paritrastena Pālakena rājñā ghoṣādānīya ghore bandhanāgāra baddhaḥ.*—Kale, M. R., *chakaṭika*, Act, IV, P. 152.

15 *Śarvilakaḥ-ahamidānīṁ.*
Jñātin viṭān svabhujavikramalabdhavarṇān rājāpamāna–
Kupitāṁśca narendrabhṛryān; Uttejayāṁi Suhṛdaḥ
Parimokṣaṇāya Yaugandharāyaṇa ivodayanasya rājñaḥ.
Ibid., IV 26, P. 152.

16 HC (Cal. ed.), VI, p. 691.

17 *Ibid.*, P. 694.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Let us take up Udayana first of all.

Bṛhatkathā having *Kathāsaritsāgara* as its faithful version,[18] takes Udaya as the son of Saharānīka and a grandson of Śatānīka born in the lineage of t Pāṇḍavas, as son of Janamejaya, grandson of Parīkṣita, great-grand-son Abhimanyu, son of Arjuna, having Viṣṇumatī as the spouse, Sahasrānīka havi Mṛgāvatī as the spouse.[19] Bhāsa takes Udayana[20] to be the son of Śatānīka a a daughter's son[21] of Sahasrānīka (Preferably so). This brings in a contr versy as to whether Bhāsa's version is a historical fact or that of Guṇāḍhya. D Jagadīśa Datta Dīkṣita[22] while dilating upon the treatment of Bhāsa regardi the themes of his plays as borrowed from the Ancient legends, takes Vatsa, t King of Kauśāmbī as ninth in descent from Arjuna of the Pāṇḍu lineage a Udayana as 26th in descent from Arjuna on general evidence of the *Purāṇ* The commentator of *Priyadarśikā*, Śrī-Kṛṣṇa takes Sahasrānīka as the sixth descent from Arjuna. Dr. Dīksita quoting *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa*, *Skandha IX*, *adhyā* (23)[23] draws the lineage as under. 1. Arjuna, 2. Abhimanyu, 3. Parīkṣit 4. Janamejaya, 5. Śatānīka, 6. Sahasrānīka, 7. Aśvamedhaja, 8. Asīm kṛṣṇa, 9. Nemicakra (Abiding in Kauśāmbī), 10. Citraratha, 11. Kaviratl 12. Vṛaṇimān (or Vṛṣṭimān as given in the text available with me), 13. Suṣe 14. Sunītha, 15. Nṛcakṣu, 16. Sukhīnala, 17. Pāriplava (as given in t with me) Paripallava, 18. Sunaya, 19. Nṛpañjaya, 20. Dūrvaḥ (as given my text) Īrṣa, 21. Timi (in my text), 22. Nimi, 23. Bṛhadratha, 24. Sudā (Sudāsa in my text), 25. Śatānīka, 26. Durdamana (Udayana), 27. Vā nara (Naravāhanadatta), 28. Daṇḍapāṇi, 29. Nimi, 30. Kṣemaka.

This list of the *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa* agrees with the one given in the *Br kathā* (*KSS*) which takes him to be a son of Sahasrānīka and a grandso Śatānīka who was born in the lineage of the Pāṇḍavas, and was a son of Jan jaya, a grand-son of Parīkṣita, a great grandson of Abhimanyu having Prim being as Arjuna, only to some extent in so far as it places Udayana in the p of Aśvamedhaja i.e. Seventh in a row from Arjuna, a point very difficult t concile with history proper having chronology for its bed rock in so far as v construed as a contemporary of Mahāsena, Darśaka, etc. (definitely of the 5th Centuries B.C.) he hardly claims an existence after Sahasrānīka (6th in

---

18 Jagadīśa lāla Śāstrī, *KSS*. 1970, *Kathā-pīṭha, Lambaka I*, Taraṅga I, Verse 10. Pl.

19 *Ibid.*, *Kathāmukha Lambaka* II., Taraṅga I, Verse 4-12, 68, 69, pp. 24, 26.

20 Sharma, S. K. *Pratijñāyaugandharāyana*, Ist ed., 1965, Act II, pp. 77-78.

21 Naptā Naptṛ-a grand son (a son's or a daughter's son) Apte, V. S., *Skt Dictionary*.

22 *Bhāsa ki Bhāṣā Sambandhinī Viśeṣatāyen*, *Ch. IV*, *Paurāṇika Kathaon ke Vivara Rūpa.*, pp. 212-214.

23 Skandha IX, Adhyāya 22, Verses 32-44, p. 471, edited by Hanumān prasāda P Seventh ed., 1961.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

of the *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa*) and certainly comes after Śatānīka (25th in line of *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa*) and coincides with Durdamana having Vahīnara (Nara-āhanadatta of *KSS*) as the descendent. In this capacity Sahasrānīka illustrated y Bhāsa in *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa* certainly comes out to be contemporary ing of Śatānīka (25th of the *Purāṇa*) and a father-in-law, the maternal grand-ther of Udayana having Mṛgāvatī (*KSS*) as his mother-in-law, the spouse of ahasrānīka. Hence Durdamana alias Udayana, son of Śatānīka (25th in line Arjuna) (*Bhāgavata-Purāṇa*, (IX.22, p. 471), father of Vahīnara seems to have en depicted by Bhāsa in his *Pratijñā Yaugandharāyaṇa* as the daughter's son Sahasrānīka and none else. This Sahasrānīka was a different person from e at No. 6 in the line drawn by the *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa*. Bhāsa's account, erefore, appears more genuine as pertaining to History and Chronology proper.

Dr. Dīkṣita's assertion[24] that Vatsarāja Udayana having got consecrated the throne between B.C. 474 and 449 established himself in his Kingdom after causing Padmāvatī, the sister of Darśaka, as upheld by Dr. A. D. Pusalkar[25], ladeva Upādhyāya,[26] amply goes in favour of this point that Udayana alias rdamana as 26th in descent from Arjuna has been referred to by Bhāsa as the of Śatānīka and the daughter's son of Sahasrānīka. Dr. Dīkṣita seems to be struing '*Naptā*' as grandson (a son's son) while making it assertive that re is no proof to substantiate it, that Udayana was the *Naptā* of Sahasrānīka son of Śatānīka.[27] Guṇāḍhya's account is, therefore, not very reasonable n it takes Udayana to be a son of Sahasrānīka, 6th in line from Arjuna. The strual of Udayana as 25th from Arjuna may also belie sober history in so as Arjuna being contemporaneous with the *Mahābhārata* war (ending 3102) may have Udayana at No. 26 in 2302 B.C. Hence the No. 26 as illustrated he *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa* may also have some anomaly to be solved on. We can postulate the existence of a Śatānīka in the 6th Century B.C. having Saha-ika as the father-in-law (Viṣṇumatī as his wife and Mṛgāvatī as the mother aw), the sire of Udayana (Durdamana) having Vāsavadattā (daughter of āsena, the king of Ujjayinī) and Padmāvatī (sister of Darśaka, the over-lord e Magadhas) as his two wives. Mahāsena and Darśaka becoming a father-v and a brother-in-law respectively from the two marriages make it ampiy that Darśaka was a junior contemporary of Mahāsena. A co-relative mporary of Gopālaka, Pālaka and Udayana seeking his help to chastise pi' the usurper. The identification of this hostile foe shall have to be t after construing the significance of the *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa* II.8[28]

Bhāsa ki Bhāṣā Sambandhinī Viśeṣatāyen., p. 213.

Bhāsa—A study, published by Messrs Munshi Ram Manoharlal, 54, Rani Jhansi Road, elhi-55, Second ed., 1968, pp. 63-84 and pp. 480-491.

Mahākavi Bhāsa, A study, 1964, pp. 150-153.

Ibid, 25 above.

Edited by Sharma, S. K. p. 74.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

"Asmatsambaddho Māgadhaḥ Kāśirājo.
Vāṅgaḥ Saurāṣṭro Maithilaḥ Śūrasenaḥ.
ete nānārthairlobhayante gunairimām.
Kaste vaiteṣāṁ pātratām yāti rājā"

i.e. The kings of Magadha, Kāśī, Vaṅga or Aṅga, Surāṣṭra, Mithilā and Śūrasen —were the aspirant candidates for wooing the hand of Vāsavadattā.

Mahāsena has given first preference to Māgadha and second to '*Kāśirāja* which means that Mahāsena had an eye of sympathy for the king of Magad i.e. Darśaka who in his early days could be a candidate for the hand of Vāsav dattā. His reverence for the king of Kāśi is apparent from the paragraph ma ing the beginning of the Act II.[29] He might have been Sañjaya as alluded above in light of the *Mālati-Mādhava* of Bhavabhūti.[30] But his preference Udayana is apparent from II.1[31] and II.3[32] wherein it is suggested that Ma sena did not have any supremacy over Udayana and had a mind to win h over by persuation failing wherein he took to the coercive means of a devi device of the shamtusker having been paid likewise in the same coin by astute statesmanship of Yaugandharāyaṇa who approved the matrimonial alli as suiting his taste. His expression '*Mama hayakhurabhinnaṁ mārgare narendrāḥ.*, "*Mukuṭataṭavilagnaṁ bhṛtyabhūtāḥ vahanti*" is significant of over-lordship of the Kings mentioned in II 8.[33]

As apparent from *Svapnavāsavadattaṁ* Darśaka had a mind for the ma tie of his sister Padmāvatī with the son of Mahāsena. It means he was an of Mahāsena. But Yaugandharāyaṇa felt it desirable to win over the alliance o Darśaka for the subversion of Āruṇi which means Darśaka had a soft corner for Āruṇi and was colluding with him confidentially for the discomfiture of Udayan who though being a son-in-law of Mahāsena, might have been his old oppone

---

29 *Kāñcukīyaḥ— Ābhīraka ! Ābhīraka ! gaccha mahā-senavacanāt pratihārarakṣakaṁ brūhi— eṣa Kāśirājopādhyāyaḥ, Ārya Jaivantiradya dautyena prāptaḥ asya sāmānyadūta-satkāraṁ pṛṣṭhataḥ kṛtya sukhamiva niveśyatām. Yathā cātithi-satkāraṁ jāniyāttathā prayatitavyaṁ iti. bhoḥ ! evaṁ nāmāhanyahani gotrānukulebhyo rājakulebhyaḥ Kanyāpradānam prati dūtasampreṣaṇā vartate. na khalu Mahāsenaḥ Kaṁcidapi pratyācaṣṭe, nacāpyanugṛhṇīte. Ibid.*, p. 58.

30 See 7 above.

31 *Vyaktaṁ na tāvat samupaiti tasya, dūto vadhūtve vihitā hi yasya. Tato na guṇān narendro, na vetti jānannapi tatpratikṣaḥ.—Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa* edited by n

32 *Mama hayakhurabhinnaṁ mārgareṇum narendrāḥ, mukuṭataṭavilagnaṁ bh vahanti. Na ca mama paritoṣo yanna mām vatsarājaḥ, praṇamati guṇaśāli kuñjarajñ* p. 62.

33 See 28 above.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

for the hand of Vāsavadattā and hence a '*Prakṛtyamitra*' of Udayana. He could easily enter into an alliance with Āruṇi even if he had a mind to marry Padmāvatī to the son of Mahāsena. But Āruṇi could be a close contender for the same on account of which Yaugandharāyaṇa had to devise the camouflage of the episode of '*Lāvāṇaka Grāmadāha*' only to create a political schism in the enemy-*saṁgha* which could prove heavily detrimental to the interests of his sovereignty. By this he weeded out the principal thorn jeopardising the major interests of the body-politic which was the mainstay of his life and that of his king.

The identification of 'Āruṇi' has not been dealt with by many scholars except few such as Mr. Soman, Mr. Deb and Dr. Bhandarkar quoted by Dr. A. D. Pusalkar[34] who says—

"No reference is found except in the *Svapna* to the rebel Āruṇi who is said to have usurped the Vatsa Kingdom and was subseqently vanquished by Udayana with the aid of the Magadha King. Harṣa probably copied the name from Bhāsa. Nothing is practically known about this Āruṇi, and Mr. Soman hazards a guess as to Āruṇi's being a forest king or a Persian. Mr. Deb also indicates Persian menace to the Vatsa Kingdom. Dr. Bhandarkar, on the other hand, presumes him to have been a King of Kośala."

Dr. Bhandarkar's conjecture poses the problem for us here to elaborate the point in the light of the available Historical Data dealt with by Scholars in their History of Ancient India and other works on history of Ancient period. Dr. R. S. Tripathi is the most striking critic coming to our rescue in affording us cues to the systematic nuancing of the facts thrashed out by him as connected closely with the problem. To reconcile with the chronological sequence of events brought to the fore by history we shall have to take note of many-sided views of a number of scholars commenting upon the contemporary historical personages reigning supreme in the *Janapada*s of Vatsa, Kāśi, Kośala, Avanti, Aṅga and others.

According to Dr. A. Pusalkar[35]

"The history of the *Paurava* Kings of Kauśāmbi is obscure. The *Purāṇās* give only a list of twenty three kings after Nicakṣu upto Kṣemaka, the last in the line. Among them Śatānīka and his son Udayana are interesting and important figures. Śatānīka also styled Parantapa, is said to have attacked Campā, the capital of Aṅga, during the reign of Dadhivāhana. Udayana succeeded his father on the Vatsa throne. According to Buddhist acconts Udayana was born on the same day as the Buddha. Whether we accept it or not there are great grounds

34 *Bhāsa—A study*, Second revised ed., Messrs Munshiram Manoharlal Nai Sarak, Delhi-6, and 54, Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi-55, January 1968, p. 293.

35 *The Vedic Age*, p. 325, 331.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

to believe that Udayana was contemporaneous with the Buddha and also with Pradyota Mahāsena of Avanti and Ajātaśatru of Magadha ".

This obviously affords us the clue to the point that the Aṅga King referred to by Mahāsena in *Pratijñā-Yaugandharāyaṇa* was a scion of Dadhivāhana who was the son of Aṅga.[36] Dadhivāhana had a daughter named Candanā or Candrabālā.[37] Aṅga seems to have been on terms of hostility all along with its neighbouring State of Magadha and one time included parts of Magadha, as would appear from the mention of the city of Rājagṛha as a City of Aṅga. The Aṅga suzerainty would also be evident from the defeat of King Bhaṭṭiya of Magadha by King Brahmadatta of Aṅga. But the Aṅga King lost its independence when Bimbisāra, son of Bhaṭṭiya avenged his father's defeat and killed the Aṅga King Brahmadatta, annexed the Capital Campā and continued there as Viceroy till he left for Rājagṛha on his father's death. Bimbisāra later converted Aṅga into a separate province and appointed his son Ajātaśatru (Kuṇika) as governor with headquarters at Campā.[38] Brahmadatta, therefore, appears to have been the son of Dadhivāhana and a contemporary of Udayana, son of Śatānīka contemporary of Dadhivāhana. Brahmadatta defeated Bhaṭṭiya King of Magadha who had Bimbisāra for his son. Bimbisāra defeated Brahmadatta and killed him. Ajātaśatru was the son of Bimbisāra who appointed him as Viceroy of Aṅga converted into a province by him.

Hence

Vatsa-kingdom	*Aṅga-kingdom*	*Magadha-kingdom*
1. Śatānīka Parantapa	1. Dadhivāhana	1. Śiśunāga
2. Udayana	2. Brahmadatta	2. Not known
		3. Not known
		4, Bhaṭṭiya
		5. Bimbisāra
		6. Ajātaśatru

appears to be the contemporary chronology of the three dynasties, Udayana having Brahmadatta as the Aṅga King and Bhaṭṭiya as the King of the Magadhas. Likewise Mahāsena had Brahmadatta as his contemporary Aṅga King and Bhaṭṭiya as the King of Magadha which means Darśaka was a variant name of Bhaṭṭiya.

Hence

Vatsa	Avanti	Aṅga	Magadha
Udayana	Mahāsena	Brahmadatta	Bhaṭṭiya alias Darśaka.

36 Ibid., p. 331.
37 Ibid., p. 332.
38 Ibid.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

must be the comparative chart on the basis of *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa* and *Svapnavāsavadattaṁ*. Udayana has been called '*Vaidehī Putra*'[39] in the *Svapnavāsavadattaṁ*. This implies cordial relation between Videha and Vasta. It also implies cordial relations of Śatānīka with that Kingdom. Dr. Pusalkar postulates the supremacy of a junior branch of the royal family of Kāśi on Videha immediately after the time of Buddha or in the time of Buddha.[40] Hence the reign of Sañjaya, King of Kāśi, on Videhas cannot be ruled out in the times of Udayana who might have had Sañjaya for his maternal cousin. Dr. Pusalkar informs us that Kaṁsa, father of Mahākośala, father-in-law of Bimbisāra, king of Magadha was a subjugator of the Kingdom of Kāśi. Mahakośala was the father and immediate predecessor of Presenajita.[41] This implies the contemporaneity of Kaṁsa and Mahākośala with Udayana. Since Kaṁsa and Mahākośala, father of Prasenajita were the kings of Kośala, we are constrained to draw the conjecture that Kaṁsa or Mahākośala could be the varient names of Āruṇi if the latter is to be identified with either of the two or even with Prasenajita if he was also a contemporary of Udayana. This is possible only if we give full credit to Dr. Bhandarkar's view as quoted by Dr. Pusalkar in his *Bhāsa—A study*. Most probably Prasenajita comes to be the nearest approach to the solution of our problem in so far as Āruṇi must have been a young king aspiring for supremacy of Viḍuḍābha, his son who rose in revolt prompting Prasenajita seek the succour of Ajātaśatru at whose gate Prasenajita died by a collapse[42]. Dr. Tripathi considers Viḍuḍābha[43] to be an atrocious king who perpetrated heinous crimes against the Śākyas. After his end Kośala became a part of Magadha. This point goes in favour of identifying Āruṇi with Viḍuḍābha, since Āruṇi was defeated and killed with the help of the Magadha King Darśaka who might have been Bhaṭṭiya, Bimbisāra or Ajātasatru, preferably Ajātaśatru, whose help was sought by Prasenajita.

Hence Mahāsena in Ujjayinī, Udayana in Vatsa, Prasenajita and Viḍuḍābha in Kośala and Ajataśatru in Magadha was the due chronological order of the sovereigns wherein Āruṇi was a second name of Viḍuḍābha (*dāruṇakarmadakṣa* of Bhāsa) and Ajātaśatru as the variant name of Darśaka alias Kuṇika.[44] Hence Āruṇi was Viḍuḍābha if Dr. Bhandarkar's view is to be given full credit. Dr. Viśuddhānanda Pāṭhaka[45] has considered Praseṇajita as the lord of Kāśī, Kośala

---

39 Gupta, D. K., *SVD*, p. 110, *Sadṛśametad Vaidehiputrasya*.
40 *The Vedic Age*, p. 331.
41 Ibid, p. 327.
42 Tripathi, R. S., *History of Ancient India*, pp. 91-92.
43 Ibid.
44 Tripathi, HAI, p. 94.
45 *History of Kośala upto the Rise of the Mauryas*, Ch. XI, pp. 211-222.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

having 'Kaśīrāja'[46] his uterine brother ruling autonomously over Kāśī (most probably bearing a variant name Sañjaya)[47] having been styled as such. Prasenajita had a mighty harem prominent figures there being Mallikā, Vāsabhakhattiyā, the slave girl, the mother of Viḍuḍābha, Ubbirī therī, Somā and Śakulā. Viḍuḍābha ascending the throne of Praseṇajita, could hardly preclude the possibility of an identification with Āruṇi which in all probability was a variant name. He was the only son of Praseṇajita as postulated by Dr. Pāṭhaka.[47] Dr. Pāṭhaka also accounts for the deluge of the Kośalan Kingdom at the hands of Magadhan Imperialism though the kingdom survived to a number of generations i.e. four. He also refers to the fact that Viḍuḍābha was swept away by that deluge.[48] Dr. R. B. Pandey in his paper 'A note on the Brahmadattas of Kāśī'[49] refers to the term 'Brahmadatta as a general honorific title of the kings of those days may be from Kāśī, Kośāla, Magadha etc., and refers to the absorption of Kāśī by the Kośalan imperialism in the sixth and fifth cent B.C.,—confirming thereby the background forming the basis of the solution of our problem in hand.

Hence Āruṇi established by Dr. Bhandarkar as the king of Kośala must have been Viḍuḍābha with whose demise the Kośalan kingdom tore to shreds in the fifth century B. C., the time of Bhāsa as also of Udayana.

---

46 See 29 above. Bhāsa originally referring to the word *Kāśirāja' in Kāśirājopadhyāyaḥ*

47 *History of Kośala*, p. 231.

48 Ibid, p. 235.

49 *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XXXVIII, No. 4, Dec. 1962, pp. 335-338.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

THE ADAPTATION OF VIṢṆU—BALI LEGEND BY JAINA WRITERS*

By

JAGDISH CHANDRA JAIN, Bombay

(Abbreviations used : ĀKM = *Ākhyānamaṇikośa*. Bhā = *Bhāṣya*. Bhag. Ārā = *Bhagavatī Ārādhanā*. BHBH = *Bhavabhāvanā*. BK = *Bṛhatkathā*. BKK = *Bṛhatkathākośa*. BKM = *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*. BKŚS = *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṅgraha*. Bṛh. Bhā. = *Bṛhatkalpa Bhāṣya*. Com = Commentary. Cū = *Cūrṇi*. HP = *Harivaṃśapurāṇa*. KSS = *Kathāsaritsāgara*. MBH = *Mahābhārata*. MP = *Mahāpurāṇa*. Nir = *Niryukti*. Niśī = *Niśītha*. PKK = *Puṇyāsravakathākośa*. Sū = *Sūtra*. TŚP = *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita*. UP = *Uttarapurāṇa*. Uttarā = *Uttarādhyayana*. VH = *Vasudevahiṇḍi*. Vya = *Vyavahāra*).

A close study of the *Chedasūtras* with their extensive commentaries reflects the extreme conditions through which Jaina monks had to pass in order to propagate their religion. Even to get a temporary dwelling-place in far off countries was a problem. They had to occupy a deserted place (*suṇṇaghara*), generally infested by women, eunuchs, wild beasts, snakes, mosquitos, ants, dogs and robbers.[1] There were political disturbances when lawlessness prevailed in the country. The monks were held as spies and prosecuted. If the ruler was not a Jaina, as it often happened, Jaina ascetics had to undergo lots of trouble. At the time of the coronation of a king the monks were supposed to attend the ceremony and offer congratulations to the newly appointed king. There were religious disputes and public discussions in the presence of a king as a presiding officer.

The rules of asceticism were strictly observed by Jaina monks. As a general rule, under unbearable conditions, they were supposed even to commit suicide rather then violate their long-cherished vow. But at times, under unavoidable calamities, they were advised to follow *apavādamārga* or exception to the rule by setting aside *utsargamārga* or a general rule. The monks have been exhorted to guard themselves even at the risk of violating their self-restraint (*sañjamāo appāṇameva rakkhanto*). It has been observed, " If a monk comes out safe of calamity, he can purify himself by the act of atonement (*pāyacchitta*) and can practise more righteousness.[2]

---

* Paper read in the Symposium held under the Department of Sanskrit, Udaipur University in October 1976.

1 *Bṛh Bhā* (1.2493-99); *Niśī Bhā Cū* (5.1914); *Ogha Nir*.218.

2 *Niśī Cū Pithikā* (451); *Bṛh Bhā Com.* (1.2900); *Bhag Ārā* (625). Compare : *Jivan dharmaṃ cariṣyāmi, MBH* (XII. 141.67)

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

In this context the monk Viṇhu (Viṣṇu) a great saviour of Jaina religion is cited as an example. It has been stated, " The holy persons who help th cause of religion like the monk Viṣṇu, or those who render help to holy person in their enterprise, are not only called pure and meritorious but are entitled t achieve liberation within a short time ".[3]

Muni Viṇhu or Viṇhukumāra is mentioned in the *Vasudevahiṇḍi*, a Prakri work of the 2nd or 3rd century A.D., composed by Saṅghadāsagaṇi Vācaka in archaic Mahārāṣṭrī. Here in the *Gandhavvadattālambha* (page 126, line 21-128, 17), Vasudeva, the hero, participates in a music concert, held every month in the city of Campā, in order to win Gandhavvadattā, the beautiful daughter of Cārudatta. Vasudeva is asked to sing the song in exaltation of Viṇhu (*Viṇhugīiyā* = *Viṣṇugītikā*). Several *vīṇās* were presented to him for use but he rejects them all pointing out minute defects in their construction. Ultimately, a perfect instrument is presented and the hero proceeds to harmonise with Gandhavvadattā. Both start playnig their instruments singing the beautiful song in exaltation of Viṣṇu. The music was accompanied by the regulated rise and fall of *Gandhāra* note, harmonised by the clapping of hands (*tāla*), the pause (*laya*) and the grip (*graha*) and perfected by the accomplishments of three bodily sites. The hero ultimately wins Gandhavvadattā and marries her.

The Origin of Viṣṇugītikā :

The *VH* contains the following legend: The minister Namuci of King Mahāpauma of Hastināpura was publicly defeated by the Jaina monks in a religious debate. The minister grew hostile to the monks, and in the meantime he managed to get a boon from the king to rule over the kingdom. When Namuci was installed on the throne he asked the monks to pay him respects. The monks showed indifference and the minister began giving them lot of trouble. He ordered them not to stay any longer in his country. The monks asked the minister to let them stay during the rainy season as the earth was full of living beings and they were prohibited to roam about in the season. But Namuci would not listen and asked them to quit the kingdom within seven nights. The monks called upon Viṇhu (or Viṇhukumāra) who was practising penance at Aṅgamandira. The ascetic comes and asks Namuci to permit the monks to stay for the rainy season. But the minister insisted that they must leave the kingdom within the appointed time. Thereupon the monk asks Namuci to grant him a space of three steps in which the Jaina monks can live unmolested during the rainy season. Namuci reluctantly agrees. Then Viṇhu flares up in great anger, his body growing larger and larger. He lifts up one huge foot to measure out the land and Namuci falls to his feet in fright. Seeing a huge body, all gods became terrified and began to tremble. He puts his right foot on the peak o

3 *Vya Bhā* (7.545-47; 1.90f, p. 76f) and com.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

the Mount Mandara. At this point everyone gets frightened that Viṇhu's rage will destroy the whole world. Heavenly nymphs perform dances and the *Gandharvas*, Tumburu, Nārada, Hāhā, Hūhū and Vissāvasū begin singing beautiful soothing songs to calm the monk's fury. They are soon joined by the *Vidyādharas*, who also recite praises to Viṇhu. The *Gandharvas*, pleased with the participation of the *Vidyādharas*, favour them with the beautiful song of *Viṇhugīyā*. It is stated that Vasudeva learnt this song of seven musical scales from Sāmalī, one of his wives.[4]

Identical Account in the BKŚS :

In the *BKŚS* of Budhasvāmin we come across exactly the identical account of the episode with the difference that Vasudeva is Naravāhanadatta, Cārudatta Sānudāsa, the song of *Viṇhugīyiā* the song of *Nārāyaṇastuti*[5] and the minister Namuci the demon Bali. It has been stated : "In ancient times Viṣṇu, the holder of the disc, took the form of a dwarf in order to humble the demon Bali, and overpowered the heaven with three steps.[6] Then Viśvāvasu, served by a host of *Gandharvas*, appeared in heaven and quickly made three circumambulations around Viṣṇu. While praising Lord Viṣṇu and holding a banner marked with *Garuḍa* bird, he sang a wonderful song known as *Nārāyaṇastuti*. The song was obtained from Viśvāvasu by Nārada, from Nārada by Arjuna, and then by Uttarā, Parikṣit, Janamejaya, Udayana, the father of Naravāhanadatta and finally from the father by the son.[7]

Bṛhatkathā of Guṇāḍhya-the Common Source:

As there are strikingly identical details of contents between the *VH* and the *BKŚS* there must have been some common source from which both have derived their material, and this common source must be the *Bṛhatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya.[8] The Viṣṇu-Bali legend like the episode of Gandharvadattās marriage of which it forms an essential part, must have been derived from the *Bṛhatkathā*. As a religious overtone is visible throughout the narration of the *VII*, it can

4 128, 18-133, 1.

5 *Vaiṣṇavastuti* or *Keśavastuti* in the *KSS* (106, 12, 18) and *Viṣṇustuti* in the *BKM* (13.71)

6 According to the Brahmanic legend, Bali was a powerful demon who oppressed the gods. The gods in turn went to Viṣṇu and asked for his protection. Viṣṇu descended to the earth, assuming the form of a dwarf. Disguised as a mendicant, he went to Bali and begged of him as much earth as he could cover in three steps. Bali acceded to dwarf's request. Then Viṣṇu assumed the mighty form and covered the entire earth with his first step, all the heavens with his second, and not knowing where to place the third one he stepped directly on Bali's head. Afterwards Viṣṇu sent Bali to the underworld by way of punishment. Apte's *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*.

7 XVII, 112-116.

8 For detailed discussion see this author's *The Vasudevahindi – An Authentic Jaina Version of the Bṛhatkarhā*, published by the L. D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

be postulated that the author has conveniently transferred God Viṣṇu of the Vedic mythology to ascetic Viṇhu or Viṇhukumāra and the demon Bali to the minister Namuci (or minister Bali by the later Jaina writers).

Traditions recorded in later Jaina writings:

The popular *BK* which was " full of wonderful meanings " has influenced Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhraṁśa literature from time to time. Besides the *BKŚS* of Buddhasvāmin, *KSS* of Somadeva and *BKM* of Kṣemendra, Sanskrit versions of the *BK* were known to Bhoja.[9] The *BK* was quite popular with Jaina writers who have assimilated the tales of this great work in their writings in different contexts Jinasena (8th century A.D.) in his *HP*, Hemacandra (12th century A.D.) in his *TŚP*, Guṇabhadra (9th century A.D.) in his *UP*, Hariṣeṇa (10th century A.D.) in his BKK, Puṣpadanta (10th century A.D.) in his *MP* and Nemicandra in his commentary of the *Uttarā* have all followed traditions which appear to be different contained in the *VH*.

It is quite interesting that the later Jaina writers, instead of following the *VH* traditions of the Viṣṇu-Bali legend, have followed the Brahmanic legend more faithfully. Jinasena mentions Bali as one of the four ministers, others being Bṛhaspati, Namuci and Prahlāda, of king Śrīdharma of Ujjayinī. A congregation of Jaina monks arrives in the city. Accompanied by his ministers the king pays visit to the monks. A religious debate is held between the monks and the ministers resulting in the defeat of the latter. The king banishes his ministers. Bali and other ministers reach Hastināpura and remain in the service of king Padma. In the meantime, the Jaina monks happened to arrive in the city. Bali manages to get a boon from the king to rule over the kingdom for a week and starts giving trouble to the monks. Viṣṇukumāra arrives in the city and tries to dissuade Bali from his wicked intention. After he failed in his endeavours he asks Bali to allow him three steps on the earth. Then he expands his body so that it reaches the heavenly spheres. He took one step onto the Meru mountain, the other on the Mānuṣottara mountain, and when there was no space left for the third one it went on round and round in heaven. The monk was pacified by the gods, the *Vidyādharas* and the flying ascetics. Then gods tied Bali up and banished him from the town.[10] The *vīṇās* were brought and given to the *Vidyādharas*. Viṣṇukumāra later on made atonement for the deeds in the presence of his teacher.[11] Almost the same narration is recorded by Guṇabhadra in his *UP*, Hariṣeṇa in *BKK* and Puṣpadanta in *MP*, all of them following the Digambara tradition.

---

9 See Raghavan, V., *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, pp. 839ff.

10 In the *BKK* (11.139) five fruits of *vilva* tree were tied to Bali's forehead, then he was made to ride a donkey and roam about the city.

11 The *HP* (20.1-65).

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Guṇabhadra seems to have followed the Brahmanic mythology more closely. Instead of four he mentions only one chief minister, named Bali, who lights a fire under the pretext of performing sacrifice and the Jaina monks are enveloped in smoke. Then Viṣṇukumāra assumes the form of a dwarf and asks Bali to give him charity. Bali was prepared to offer him anything what he wished but the *Brāhmin* asked only as much earth as could be covered in three steps. After Bali was tied up he becomes a follower of Jaina faith.[12] Puṣpadanta almost follows Guṇabhadra.[13]

Another tradition of the Viṣṇu-Bali legend followed by Jaina writers is represented by Nemicandra in his commentary of the *Uttarā* and the *TŚP* of Hemacandra. Though both represent the Śvetāmbara tradition like that of the *VH*, it is different from the latter. Nemicandra and Hemacandra both mention king Paumuttara or Padmottara instead of Paumaraha in the *VH* (Megharatha in the *UP* and *MP*). According to them, king Paumuttara had two queens, Jvālā and Lakṣmī. The former, who was the mother of Viṣṇukumāra and Mahāpadma, was a follower of Jaina religion, whereas the latter followed the Brahmanic faith. Namuci was a well-known minister of Siridhamma (Śrīvarman in the *TŚP*). Both describe the adventures of Mahāpauma which are not found either in the *VH* or the Digambara tradition. Mahāpauma leaves the city and arrives at a hermitage. After visiting other places he returns home with all the magnificence of a Cakravartin. Both of them mention *seyabhikkhu* (the Śvetāmbara monks) instead of the Jaina monks. Then Gaṅgamandira and Mandara are mentioned by Nemicandra and Hemacandra respectively in place of Aṅgamandira in the *VH*. Nemicandra refers to the atonement of Viṣṇukumāra, who practised penance and attained liberation according to both. Both, unlike the author of the *VH*, address the monk Viṣṇu by the purifying name Tivikkama or Trivikrama (three steps ; Viṣṇu in his dwarf incarnation) as stated in the Brahmanic legend. Both introduce the Viṣṇu-Bali legend in the context of narrating the life of Mahāpauma or Mahāpadma, the ninth *Cakravartin*; it does not form a part of the Gandharvadattā tale as in the *VH*, or the Digambara tradition or the non-Jaina version of the *BK*.

A comparative study of the Viṣṇu-Bali legend recorded by Jaina authors can be a subject matter of further research. An earlier reference to the song in praise of Viṣṇu related to the Viṣṇu-Bali episode, however, seems to have been made in the *BK* from which the authors of the *VH* and the *BKŚS* have borrowed.

Adventurous story of Cārudatta:

Like the episode of Viṣṇu-Bali legend the adventurous story of Cārudatta also forms an integral part of the Gandharvadattā tale. This story has been

12 The *UP* (70.274-300).
13 The *MP* (LXXXIII.14-19).

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

extremely popular among the Jainas including Saṅghadāsagaṇi Vācaka and other Jain writers who were tempted to use it as their own theme. Jinasena in his *HP* (21.6-36), Hariṣeṇa in *BKK* (93), Nemicandra in *ĀMK* (23.210-17), Maladhari Hemacandra in *BHBH* (1814-29), Hemacandra in *TŚP* (8.2.190-302) and Rāmacandra Mumukṣu in *PKK* (12-13 have incorporated the Cārudatta tale to such an extent that it is difficult to distinguish from the original as contained in the *BK*.

We have seen how God Viṣṇu has been transformed into ascetic Viṣṇukumāra by Jainas. In the following story of Cārudatta we shall notice a religious colouring though of somewhat different nature. The story is narrated in the *VH* as follows : In the company of his fellow merchants Cārudatta is proceeding to Ratnadvīpa. After the merchants cross the dangerous goat-track mounting on their goats, the caravan leader asks them to kill their goats, eat the flesh, and slip into the remaining skin-bags so that the flesh-eating huge *Bhāruṇḍa* birds would mistake them for raw meat and carry them off the Ratnadvīpa. Cārudatta as a true devotee of the Jaina religion refuses to kill his goat. He lodges a firm protest against committing such a heinous crime and threatens to commit suicide himself. Ultimately, Cārudatta preaches abandonment of sinful activities to the animal, who was standing before him motionless and ready to be killed.[14]

The same story is also recorded in the *BKŚS* where the caravan leader recites a verse from the *Bhagavadgīta* in support of slaying and prompts Sānudāsa (Cārudatta of the *VH*) to kill his own goat as Arjuna was prompted by Kṛṣṇa to kill his own relatives.[15]

It need not be repeated that the Cārudatta (Sānudāsa) is an essential part of the Gandharvadattā tale contained originally in the *BK*.

There are a number of other popular tales, sometimes interwoven with sub-stories, which have been moulded by Jaina writers with a religious tinge to emphasise or clarify a doctrine. The story of Prasannacandra and Valkalacīrin contained in the *VH* (16, 16-20, 2), for example, is noticed not only in the Brahmanic and Buddhist works but has also reached the countries of China, Tibet and Europe. "The Parable of Honey-drop" (*madhubindu*) recorded in the *VH* (8,3-23) is another parable which has found a place with Brāhmaṇas, Buddhists and even Mohammedans, Christians and Jews.[16] "The Hawk and the Dove" story of the *VH* (337,5-338, 4), a story of self-sacrifice, is also recorded in the *KSS* (1.88-107), the *MBH*(*Śānti* P., 143-49) and the *Sivi Jātaka* (499). "A quarrel between two mothers" narrated in the *VH* (354, 12-19) is popular

14 149, 4-23.

15 XVIII, 479-480.

16 Jacobi, Hermann, *Pariśiṣṭaparvan*, p. xxxvii, Calcutta, 1932.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

all over the world. Besides the *Mahâummagga Jâtaka* (546) it is recorded in the *Holy Bible* (3,26-28).

This only shows that the Jaina writers were always in search of some popular fascinating tales so that they could make them suitable for their religious sermons. As a result they picked up all sorts of stories and converted them to their requirements. The adaptation of Viṣṇu-Bali legend of the Vedic mythology is such an example which reflects the spirit of assimilation of Jaina writers.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

THE CULT OF SUDĀMĀ IN PORBANDAR-SUDĀMĀPURĪ

By

FRANCOISE MALLISON, Paris

Porbandar (*Porabandara*), famous nowadays as the birthplace of Mahātmā Gāndhī, is a harbour town on the Southern coast of Saurashtra (*Saurāṣṭra*). It was the capital of Porbandar State. It is 120 miles Southeast of Dwarka (*Dvārakā*), the *tīrtha* of Kṛṣṇa-Raṇachoḍa where Kṛṣṇa is worshipped as Jagadīśa and Dvārakānātha.[1] On his way to Dwarka the pilgrim offers nowadays worship in Porbandar, also known as Sudāmāpurī, to the Brahmin friend and devotee of Kṛṣṇa, in the Sudāmā temple there.[2]

The *Sudāmapura-Māhātmya* :

The story of the origin of Sudāmāpurī is narrated in a *Sudāmapura Māhātmya* belonging to a local version of the *Skanda Purāṇa* (*Prahlādoktam Saṁhitā*).[3] Surprisingly enough the account does not allude to the Brahmin friend of Kṛṣṇa whose story is told in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* and many vernacular *Sudāmā caritras*,[4] but, instead, it praises the merits of two places in Porbandar : the confluent of the river Aśmāvatī with the sea and the sacred *kuṇḍa* of the temple of Kedār which had been established by a Brahmin also named Sudāmā. According to this *māhātmya* :

This is the second part of a study on Sudāmā in Gujarat-Saurashtra (Gujarāta-Saurāṣṭra). The first part published in *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Vol. 29, Nos. 1-2, pp. 90-99 deals with the story of Sudāmā in mediaeval Gujarati (Gujarātī) literature.

1 According to the *Mahābhārata*, Dvārakā was the place where Kṛṣṇa, fleeing the army of Jarāsandha, took refuge. He made it his capital and stayed there till his death. This legendary golden Dvārakā was engulfed by a seacataclysm. Doubts have been raised concerning the location of the primitive Dvārakā. Recent research, however, tends to locate it at the site of the present Dvārakā (Dwarka); see A. D. Pusalker, "Dvaraka", in *B. C. Law Volume*, part I (Calcutta, 1945), pp. 218-224; H.D. Sankalia, "Dwarka in Literature and Archaeology", in : Z. D. Ansari and M. S. Mate, *Excavations at Dwarka* (Poona, 1966), pp. 1-17.

2 I had the opportunity of visiting Porbandar and the Sudāmā Temple in October, 1972, and again in December, 1976. I am grateful to Mr. M. Vora President of the Archaeological Research Society of Porbandar and author of a historical pamphlet "*Porbandar*", 1970, 30 pp. for his information concerning the antiquity of the city, and also to Mr. D. Modha who specializes in the history of Jeṭhavā dynasty, for his information on local oral traditions.

3 Gandhi, M. K. (Ed.), *Śrī Sudāma Māhātmya*, 4th ed. (Porbandar, S. 1968, (1911 A.D.)), pp. 117-130, with Gujarati translation. The editor affirms in the preface (p. 2) that he has reproduced these verses from "a very old manuscript", without any further precision.

4 The legendary Sudāmā appears anonymously in the tenth book of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, chapters 80 and 81. On the vernacular Sudāmā caritras : Saint Sudāmā of Gujarat in *Journal of the Oriental Institute of Baroda*, Vol. 29, Nos. 1-2, pp. 90-99.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

A Brahmin called Somaśarmā of the lineage of Bhṛgu was residing on the bank of the Aśmāvatī and after doing severe penance was blessed with a son named Sudāmā [5] Both father and son were worshippers of Viṣṇu, but Sudāmā had a special attachment to Śiva; every year he went on pilgrimage to Kedāranātha in the Himalayas and Śiva pleased with his devotion came to stay for five days in the city of his devotee (v.21-22) and established the Kedāra temple and *kuṇḍa* in Sudāmapura.

It is difficult to attribute any authenticity and date to this text,[6] but there is archaeological evidence in favour of the antiquity of the places it mentions.

Porbandar was first quoted in an inscription of the Xth century as *Pauravelākula*[7]. Most probably it was peopled by sailors and *khāravā* fishermen using the harbour provided by the mouth of the Aśmāvatī river which forms at this place a creek, the *Khāḍī*.[8] The name seems to be derived from the local tutelary goddess, Porāva or porāī mātā. The precincts of her temple house sculptures anterior to the IXth century.[9]

The temple of Kedāranātha standing in the centre of the present Porbandar is situated between the old harbour and the present temple of Sudāmā further to the East; it was partially restored in 1895, but can be dated to the XIIIth century as in the entry of the nearby *Kedārajīkuṇḍa* there is a damaged image of Viṣṇu with an inscription of which only the date can be read : S. 1327 (1270 A.D.). The Kedāranātha temple was one of the *tīrtha* on the pilgrim's way along the

---

5 The name is spelt either *Sudāmā* (Skt. *Sudāman*, in composition *Sudāma-*) or *Sudāma* (Skt. *Sudāma*, in composition *Sudām-*), the meaning is the same : " giving well, bestowing abundantly, bountiful ".

6 Kane, P. V., *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. V, Part II, 2nd ed. (Poona, 1962), p. 912 thinks that the *Skanda-Purāṇa* was composed during the 7th-9th centuries, but states that " in such a huge work interpolations could easily be made ". The large number of *māhātmya* contained in this workdate more or less from the mediaeval period, many of them are not found in the Veṅkaṭeśvara Press edition, as for instance the *Sudāmapura Māhātmya* which belongs most probably to a local version of the *Skanda-Purāṇa*. See also R. N. Mehta and S. G. Kantawala " Pātāla-Vivara Myth in the Prabhāsakhaṇḍa—a study ", *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda, XXV (1975/1976), pp. 140-144, who assign a late date (XIIIth-XIVth century) to a local *māhātmya* contained in the *Prabhāsakhaṇḍa* of the *Skanda-Purāṇa*.

7 i.e. the harbour of Paura, see the Ghumli copper plates of Bāṣkaladeva S.1045 (989 A.D.), recording the grant of a village. D.C. Sircar, " Ghumli plates of Bāṣkaladeva ", *Epigraphia Indica*, XXXI, (1955-56), (Delhi, 1960), pp. 11-16, identifies *Pauravelākula* with Porbandar.

8 Now dry except during the rainy season. The stony bed gave the river its home (from *aśman* ' stone ').

9 In the compound of the temple, an open, somewhat ruined and ancient shrine contains the *sthānaka* of the *Sapta-mātṛkā* together with an idol of Kārtikeya and one of Gaṇeśa, they are known as *Nava Durgā*. The *Mātṛkā* have two arms (and not four as it is usual after the IXth century).

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

shore of Saurashtra stretching between Prabhas-Patan (*Prabhāsa-Pāṭaṇa*) an Dwarka.[10]

Origin of the present Sudāmā :

At the origin of the present Sudāmā temple is, according to tradition, th little hut (*jhonpaḍuṁ*) of Sudāmā, the devotee of Kedāranātha. His hut, an later the temple erected at its place, is located in the compound of the temple o the fierce Cāmuṇḍā devī which was situated in the forest outside the city limit before Porbandar gained its present importance.[11] The present Sudāmā temple, however, is set apart for the Brahmin Sudāmā, the friend of Kṛṣṇa, and the story of its origin as told in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* has entirely replaced the account o the *Skanda Purāṇa*. Although there is no allusion to this effect in the *māhātmya* of the *Skanda Purāṇa*, it seems that the Sudāmā devotee of Kedāra was identifie with the Brahmin friend of Kṛṣṇa. This might have happened when the krishnaite pilgrimage to Dwarka became more and more popular, so that it proved to b convenient for this place to have a share in the legend of Kṛṣṇa. The identity o the name might have suggested it : although no name is given to the Brahmi friend of Kṛṣṇa in the 80th and 81st chapters of the 10th book of the *Bhāgavat Purāṇa*, some versions give the name of Śrīdāmā in the colophon of the 80t chapter.[12] But if Śrīdāmā and Sudāmā are the names of Young cowherd friend of Kṛṣṇa in *Goku'a* well attested by purāṇic tradition [13], the name of Sudām

---

10 The *liṅgam* now worshipped in the temple of Kedāranātha comes, according to J Burgess (*Report on the Antiquities of Kāṭhiāvāḍ and Kachh, Archaeological Survey of India; N.I.S vol.* 2, 1874-1875, repr. (Varanasi, 1971), p. 179), from the ruined Navalakhā temple of Ghum the old capital of the Jeṭhavā dynasty of Porbandar.

11 It remains unclear why Sudāmā either as the devotee of Kedāranātha or as the Brahm friend of Kṛṣṇa-chose to stay in the Cāmuṇḍā devī temple, for neither in the *Sudāmapu Māhātmya* nor anywhere else a link can be found between Sudāmā and Cāmuṇḍā devi or h temple.

12 " *Iti . . . . . Śrīdāmacarite'ṣṭitamo'dhyāyaḥ* " in the Gitā Press edition, Vol. II, 4t ed. (Gorakhpur, 1961), p. 618. The same colophon is found in the Nirṇayasāgara Pres edition (Bombay, 1894), in the edition of A. V. Narasiṁhācārya (Madras, 1912), and D. Sāṃvalārāma (Bombay, 1928). A modern sanskrit drama by Sāma Rāja Dikṣita tells the story of Sudāmā under the title of " *Śrīdāmacaritra* ", cf. H. H. Wilson, *Select specimens of the theatre of the Hindus*, Vol. 2, (London, 1835), pp. 404-406.

13 Śrīdāmā, *gopa* in *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa*, X.15, 20; X.18, 23-24; X.22-31; and also *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, V. 9, 13-14; *Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa*, III, 42-55; III, 43-29. Sudāmā, may be a variant o Śrīdāmā, does not appear in the available editions of the *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa*. But the traditio of his being a *gopa* friend of Kṛṣṇa is well established in the *Pañcarātra saṁhitā* literature and i vernacular krishnaite literature (as in Sūra Dāsa, *Sūra Sāgara*, ed. S. Vājapeyī, 3rd ed., Vol. (Benares, 1958), p. 343 and 399, (X. 244; X. 410; the latter starts " *Subala, Sudāmā aru Śr dāmā, saṅga lie saba gvāla!* "). See the *Sanskrit Wörterbuch* by O. Böthlingk and R. Ro Vol. 7, (St. Petersburg, 1875), p. 1059, and the *Bhāratavarṣīya prācīna caritrakośa* by S. Chitr (Poona, 1964), p. 1055, n°9.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

given to this Brahmin friend seems to belong to secondary or comparatively recent sanskrit literature.[14] The name occurs, however, quite early in vernacular accounts, at the beginning of the XIVth century in the old Marathi (*marāṭhi*) prose "*Sudāmadevā rājyapradāna-kathana*" of the Mahānubhāva author Cakradhara in his *Śrīkṛṣṇacaritra* as written down by his disciple Mahendrabhaṭṭa (or Bhāskarabhaṭṭa).[15] The *Sudāmā caritras* frequently found in the mediaeval vernacular literatures are most probably responsible for the diffusion of the name and fame of Sudāmā all over North India together with the raising importance of the cult of Kṛṣṇa from the XVIth century onwards. When the pilgrimage to Dvārakādīśa was established, it thus does not seem impossible that the Brahmin friend of Kṛṣṇa popularly known as Sudāmā was identified with the Sudāmā devotee of Kedāra at Porbandar-Sudāmpura, a halting place on the way to Dwarka.[16] It is difficult, however, to ascertain the time at which this occured.

14 The oldest known ms. of the *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa* (XIVth-XVth century) of Kashmiri origin and liable to preserve a much older tradition, does not give any name, neither in the text nor in the colophon, see H. Bechert, ed., *The Bhāgavatapurāṇa, the birch bark manuscript in the State and University Library in Göttingen* (New Delhi, 1976), p. 749-755. Sanskrit works posterior to the XVth century, such as the *Brahmavaivarta-Purāṇa* (IV. 113. 40-44) or the *Sudāmā carirta*, by Śrīnivāsa (cf. M. Krishnamachariar, *History of classical Sanskrit literature*, 3rd ed., (Delhi, 1974), p. 307, n°254 and p. 433, n°441) use Sudāmā. But another tradition has *Kucaila* "the one in rags", an epithet of Sudāmā and his wife in *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa* (X.80.7; X.80.25). See S. Chitrao, *op. cit.*, p. 144. The name of "Kucaila" or "Kucela" is quite popular in South Indian languages: the *Kucelopākhyānams* in Tamil, Telugu and Kannada are as numerous as the *Sudāmā caritras* of North Indo-Aryan languages. The South Indian commentaries of the *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa* give the name Kucela as in the *Bhāgavatacandrikā* by Virarāghava (X.80.7, 11, 13, 15, 24, 41) and the *Munibhāvaprakāśikā* of Kṛṣṇaguru (Narasiṁhācārya) (X.81.39). The name of Kucela is already found in a text of the 13th century: the *Vairāgyapañcaka* of Vedāntadeśika.

15 Tulpule, S. G. (Ed.), *Śricakradhara nirūpita Śrikṛṣṇacaritra* (Poona, 1973), pp. 132f. This XIIIth/XIVth century Marathi prose version shows already a number of additional features to be found in later vernacular accounts, namely the fact that Sudāmā receives not only a palace as in the *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa* but an entire town named Sudāmapurī built by Viśvakarmā where Sudāmā was crowned king. Cakradhara is said to have come to Maharasthra (*Mahārāstra*) from Gujarat (*Gujarāta*), cf. S. G. Tulpule, *Mahānubhāva pantha āṇi tyāce vāṅmaya* (Poona, 1976), p. 31. On the authorship of the *Śrikṛṣṇacaritra*, see S. G. Tulpule, *An old Marathi reader* (Poona, 1960), p. 172. The Marathi poet-saint Nāmadeva supposed to have lived in the XIVth century, also wrote a *Sudāmacaritra*, see K. N. Joshi, ed., *Śri sakala santa gāthā*, 2nd ed., (Poona, 1967),I,p. 397. But it remains unclear whether this *Sudāmacaritra* must be attributed to the great Nāmadeva or to the Viṣṇudāsa Nāmā of the XVIth century, see U. Joshi, A. Raval and Y. Shukla, *Gujarāti sāhityano itihāsa*, Vol. II, (Ahmedabad, 1976), pp. 116f.

16 Similarly, the *āśrama* of Sāndīpani, the guru of Kṛṣṇa and Sudāmā, was identified, according to local popular tradition, with a cave in the Bardā Mountains just North of Porbandar, although *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa* (X.45) tells that the young princes, Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma, studied in Avantī. Gujarati mediaeval authors follow eventually the *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa* as for instance. Jagannātha in his Sudāmo (1704 A.D.): "*nāma Sudāmo māharuṁ, nagara Ujeṇīthāma*" Majmudar, M. R. (ed.), *Sudāmācaritra* (Baroda, 1922), V. 38, p. 128.

 CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

We know that the popularity of the pilgrimage to Dvārakānātha dates from th XVth-XVIth centuries as they are no earlier inscriptions recording gifts to th temple of Dvārakādīśa.[17]

Instances of krishnaization of worship places in Gujarat :

In connection with the raising fame of Dvārakānātha, this is not a uniqu case of allegiance changing from Śiva to Kṛṣṇa. Indeed only 40 miles NW Porbandar, there is on the coast the Mher village Visāvāḍā or Mūḷa Dvārakā wit the temple of Mūḷadvārakādīśa, a sort of a double shrine : on the back wall o the *garbhagṛha* is the *mūrti* of Dvārakādīśa, a replica of Dvārākanātha, an below on the flour is a *Śivaliṅgam* : Nīlakaṇṭha[18]. Both gods receive th same honour, are worshipped turn by turn. According to the *Gosvāmī* priest Śiva has been here first and has invited Kṛṣṇa. The local legend tells that in th second half of the XVIIth century, a devotee of Dvārakānātha Viñgali living i Visāvāḍā used to visit Dwarka regularly, and who getting old had a vision o the god telling him to build a shrine at Visāvāḍā for easy worship. This shrin was later on declared to be the Mūḷadvārakādīśa[19] This story echoes th one told about Dakor (Ḍākora)[20], the great Raṇachoḍa temple in Kair (*Kheḍā*) district. According to the *Ḍākora Māhātmya* (*Ḍaṅkapura Māhātmyam*) Boḍāṇo, a devotee of Dvārakānātha and responsible for bringing the Dvārakā nātha *mūrti* to Dakor, had been a worshipper of Śiva in the temple of Ḍaṅkanāth before he started to go regularly to Dwarka in order to present Kṛṣṇa with *tulasī*. As he became old, the god let himself be stolen by Boḍāṇo and b brought to Dakor. It seems that the *mūrti* was housed, not without difficulties

---

17 At least to the actual temple dating back to the XVth-XVIth century (see K. Sompur " Dvārakānāṁ Traṇa Mandira ", *Dvārakā Sarvasaṅgraha (Gujarata itihāsa pariṣadanā chaṭhṭ adhiveśanani smārikā*) ed. P. Gokani and S. Dave (Dwarka, 1973), pp. 258-262 and *ibid* pp. 232-248 : H. G. Shastri, " *Dvārakā ane Beṭanā mahattvanā abhilekha* "). See al M. R. Majumdar, " Dwārkā image of Raṇachoḍjī and the temple at Dākora ", *Journal of t University of Bombay*, XVI-4 (1948), p. 57, and H. Goetz, *Mirā Bāi, her life and times* (Bomba Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1966), p. 28.

18 Cousens, H., *Somanātha and other mediaeval temples in Kāṭṭhiāwād*, Archaeologica Survey of India, Imperial Series, XLV, (Calcutta, 1931), p. 44, " Those (i.e. shrines of Śaṅkara and Raṇachoḍajī) are twin shrines, facing one another, within a raised paved courtyard ". In fact it is the same shrine which houses Śaṅkara and Raṇachoḍarāyajī, and it faces a twi shrine dedicated also to Śiva.

19 According to S. H. Desai, *Dwārakā* (Junagadh, 1974), p. 37, Viñjat bhakta, a Mhe of Visāvāḍā, had brought the idol of Dvārakādhīśa in A.D. 1206 or a little earlier (probabl Desai was influenced by an inscription found in the opposite temple of Raṇachoḍajī and Nīl kaṇṭha, dedicaed to Siddheśvara Mahādeva, saying that someone set up the image of Rāṇ Śrī Vikramāditya in S. 1262, 1205/1206 A.D.). H. Cousens, *op. cit.*, p. 44 and fig. XLIII-XL lists archaeological remains anterior to the Xth century in Visāvāḍā and numerous old here stones some of them protected by a small structure.

20 Majmudar, M. R., " Dwārkā image of Raṇachoḍji, " *op. cit.*, in note 17, pp. 57-9

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

at first in the very temple of Ḍaṅkanātha, before a series of temples was built for him one after the other.[21] However, the same *sevaka-pūjārīs* of Ḍaṅkanātha, called *Tapodhana* Brahmins, along with some other ones later on continued to officiate for the new cult, exactly as Visāvāḍā's Raṇachoḍarāyajī is served by the same *Gosvāmī-pūjārīs*, who had served Śaṅkara.

Again the *pūjārīs* who serve the Sudāmā temple in Porbandar are the same as those who do *sevā* to Cāmuṇḍa devī. They belong to the Bāvā-rāmānandī, a community of priests for the "thirteen tribes" spread along Saurashtra's southern coast. The Bāvā are usually shivaite and nonvegetarian ; they bear the epithet of Rāmānandī when they have been converted to Vaishnavism[22].

The shrine of Sudāmā in Porbandar :

No trace can be found today of the hut-*jhonpaḍun* of Sudāmā which preceded the big new temple. I was told[23] that Sudāmā's old temple was a small shrine, a simple shelter protecting a *stambha* or *pāḷiyo*, that is a hero stone erected to commemorate the death of, usually, a warrior,[24] eventually here of the Brahmin Sudāmā[25], and that Māravāḍī pilgrims whose halt at Porbandar on their way to Dwarka is of importance mainly because of the *Lākhacorāsi*

---

21 *ibid.*, p. 67.

22 The priests of the Bāvā community are assimilated in this region to the ordinary shivaite *Gosvāmī* priests. In the Sudāmā temple, and also in the Somanātha temple near the Aśmāvatī ghāṭa, the Bāvā priests have taken the initiation in the sect of Ramānanda and are styled Rāmānandi Bāvā. They have become Vaiṣṇava and vegetarian, together with the temple they serve. Bāvā priests offer their services to the authochthonous groups of farmers, shepherds and—in the old days—soldiers spread along the coast of Saurashtra, i.e. to the Koḷi, Āhīṛa, Rabārī, Mhera, Kāṭhī, Vāghera, Khāravā, ... They are called the thirteen *vīra jātio* "heroic tribes"; cf. G. D. Rayacura, *Sabaḷa bhūmi Gujarāta* (Baroda, 1948).

23 See note 2.

24 These memorials stand at the entrance of almost every villages in Saurashtra, and even in Gujarat; They commemorate the death, of protectors of the village, or of saviour, of the cattle from the hands of thieves. Some are in the memory of faithfull *satis*, some of Rajput warriors. In the old harbour of Porbandar, there is near the Porāva mātā temple a row of *pāḷiyā* commemorating the heroic deaths of some Khāravā fishermen, there are more *pāḷiyā* in the compounds of the Kedāranātha temple and of the Porāva mātā temple itself.

For a description of the cult offered to memorial stones at Ratadi, a village mid-way between Porbandar and Visāvāḍā, see E. Fischer and H. Shah, *Rural craftsmen and their work* (Ahmedabad, National Institute of Design, 1970), pp. 39-43 and photos 42-45.

25 Hero-stones placed in small shrines and object of special worship are not unusual in the region, see H. Cousens, *op. cit.*, in note 18, p. 45. But *pāḷiyā* erected for a Brahmin are not so frequent. A very interesting one, in the compound of the Porāva mātā temple, shows a warrior on a horse and with a spear in his hand; the stone faces West, instead of East as usual, is smeared with *sindūra*, and a brahmanical thread round the pillar indicates the caste of the hero. This is a certain Dudhādhārī, a Kandoḷiā Brahmin, who died while protecting the *devī* Porāvā mātā during a muslim attack, says the legend. There is no inscription on the stone, but its style recalls the XIVth century *paḷiyā* of Ghumli, the old capital of the Jeṭhavā rulers.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

parikramā[26], were accustomed to hail the hero stone there shouting " *Sudāmāpurī kī jaya* ". This *pāḷiyo* was not placed in the new temple containing statues of Sudāmā and his wife Suśīlā. The memory is still alive of a memorial stone nearby, broken and removed now, which commemorated a Moḍha Brahmin who died in S. 1706 (1649 A.D.)[27]. But his name is not known, so there is not much scope for thinking that he was the Sudāmā of the Māravāḍī pilgrims.

The present Sudāmā temple was completed in S. 1959 (1903 A.D.), the construction work having been started at the initiative of the English administrator and officials, local merchants and dignitaries. The number of pilgrims had become so important at Sudāmā's *jhonpaḍuṁ* or *deruṁ* that a temple became necessary. In the same compound, it stands back to back with the shrine of Cāmuṇḍā devī[28]. All offerings are vegetarian now. Cāmuṇḍā devī was no doubt the only main deity before the advent of Sudāmā. Their shrines are surrounded by smaller ones and holly spots (a well, the *Lākhacorāsī parikramā*[29], the tutelary deity of the Bhāṭiā caste : Bhāṭiā dādā, Hanumān, Śiva,...), in the large compound numerous sādhus will teach *pravacana*, a big hall in front of the Sudāmā temple was recently constructed for the groups listening to the sermons.

Sudāmā and his wife Suśīlā are represented in their temple by two standing images, with two arms (*dvibhuja*), roughly sculptured in a darkish stone ; the attire of Sudāmā is similar to the one of Kṛṣṇa, he wears the same *mukuṭa*, his dress is changed on each *ekādaśī* ; on one side there is an image of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā engraved on a metal plate. Sudāmā and his wife receive the same cult as Kṛṣṇa does in the nearby shrines of Junagadh (Jūnāgaḍha) (in the temples of Dāmodara and Raṇachoḍa and in the Narasiṁha Mahetāno coro) and of Tulasiśyāma in the Gir Hills. It is a simplified version of the Vallabhite cult[30]

26 Or *pheri*, consisting in walking along a small labyrinth of red bricks in order to obtain *mokṣa*.

27 According to Mr. Vora (cf. note 2) the stone was sheltered in a little shrine together with the *pāḷiyo* of a rajput Rāmadeva, bearing the date of S. 1630, 1573 A.D. This Rāmadeva might be the Jeṭhavā killed by his maternal uncle Jāma Satāji of Jamnagar (*Jāmanagara*).

28 Cāmuṇḍā is represented here as a peaceful *devī*; this may be a consequence of the influence of Krishnaism and of the cult of Sudāmā. At her left side in the sanctuary stands Vārāhī Mātājī. Vārāhī, the consort of Varāha, *avatāra* of Viṣṇu, is a local *kuladevī* of Brahmins (the cult of Varāha was important in this area between VIth and IXth century, as may be seen from the archaeological remains of several Varāha temples, for instance at Kadwar (*kadavāra*) near Somnath (*Somanātha*).

29 see note 26.

30 Vallabhite religious leaders, i.e. Vallabha, Viṭṭhala, Hariraya spread their form of *sevā* in the Kṛṣṇa temples of Gujarat even when these temples did not directly belong to them, as for instance in Dwarka or Dakor; for Dakor, see M. R. Majmudar, " Dwaraka image of Raṇachodji and the temple at Dakor "; *op. cit.* in note 17, p. 67. The smaller krishnatie temples, also independant of the Vallabhite movement, but unable to bear the expenses of such magnificant liturgy, seem to have adopted a simplified version of it.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

and consists of four services : *āratī* in the morning and in the evening, a full meal is offered at noon and a light one in the evening. When I witnessed the evening *āratī* in October 1972, the *pūjārī* seemed to reproduce with sincerity the long march of the poor Brahmin to Dwarka. The annual festival coinciding with the inaugural day of the new temple supposedly celebrates Sudāmā's birthday; it is held on the eighth day of the bright half of the month of *Pauṣa* and it was :

> "celebrated gorgeously in the former Porbandar State. Idol of Sudāmā was taken in a silver palanquin to Dwārkānāthjī Havelī in a procession with State officers and civilians. On return after *pūjā* there, it turned into a public meeting. Learned Brahmins gave discourses and recited *Rudrī*".[31]

When the data given by the *Sudāmapura Māhātmya* are brought together with the traditions surrounding the Sudāmā temple in Porbandar, it becomes clear that this cult, now krishnaite, has taken root on a Śiva cum Devī cult substructure. Again the rather recent double *mūrti* of Sudāmā and his wife seems to be a consequence of the importance taken by Suśīlā in the *Sudāmā caritra*s and it tends to prove that the local cult at Porbandar depends on the hagiographic development of the story of Sudāmā from the XVIth to the XVIIIth century. On the other hand the influence of the Vallabhite liturgy and the active part taken by the *Havelī* in the annual festival as well as the conversion of the Bāvā priests to Vaishnavism show the completion of the process of vishnuization.

---

31 See Trivedi, R. K., (ed.) of Census of India 1961, Vol. V, Gujarat, part VII-B, *Fairs and Festivals*, (Delhi, 1969), part II, Appendix to table I, p. 195.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

GO-VIJÑĀNA MANUSCRIPTS IN THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE, BARODA[1]

By

J. P. THAKER, Baroda

As narrated in the wide-spread witty tales of Emperor Akabar and his minister Birabal, the former once put a simple but significant question to his courtiers : " Whose son is the greatest of all ?" Most of them replied that the Emperor's son was the greatest of all. It was only Birabal who could promptly offer the correct reply to the utmost satisfaction of the Emperor :

" The cow's son is the greatest of all ! "

This brief statement of Birabal is very significant for the human race in general and India in particular, in whose economy agriculture has been playing a vital role since the hoary age of the *Ṛgveda*. As such the cow-family has been enjoying a very important, holy and vital place in Indian civilization and culture, as borne out by the copious references to it met with in the different strata of ancient Indian literature through the *Vedas*, the Epics, the *Purāṇas*, the *Smṛtis* and so on. *Go-vijñāna* is, therefore, a significant subject of study and research.

The Oriental Institute, Baroda has preserved certain manuscripts on *Gaja-vidyā* and *Aśva-vidyā*, but it does not possess any manuscript on *Go-vidyā* or *Go-vijñāna* discussing such topics as the breeding of the cow-family, its diseases and their remedies. All the same, it has preserved two manuscripts parts whereof deal with *Go-vijñāna* in a general way. They enumerate certain types of bulls and cows and point out their characteristic features. In the following lines is given a brief account of the relevant portions of these manuscripts, both of which are Devanāgarī transcripts of certain South Indian manuscripts procured by the Institute in 1930 A.D.

One of these manuscripts is entitled *Kāśyapīya-Kṛṣi-Śākti* (Accession No. 13514) assigned to an ancient sage named *Kāśyapa*. It has in all 77 leaves, 28.5 × 21 cms in size, with the extent of about 900 *granthas*, written on one side of the paper. It is an ancient work on Agriculture divided into 4 parts treating respectively of *Dhānyādi-kṛṣi krama*, *Śākādī-kṛṣi-krama*, *Bhojyābhojya-krama* and *Vividha-havya-nivedana-krama*.

---

1 An enlarged English version of the speech delivered in Hindi on the 28th October 1979 at the *Bhāratiya* Go-vijñāna Conference held by the Akhila Bhārata Kṛṣi Go-sevā Saṅgha at the Bhāratiya Vidyā Bhavan, Bombay-7.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

In the introductory portion, after the worship of the plough-share, the worship of the *Vṛṣabha* is laid down before actually starting the work of ploughing. At the close of the hymn to the *Vṛṣabha*, the sage ordains that :

इत्येवं प्रार्थ्य वृषभं पूजयित्वा विशेषतः ।
श्रान्ता यथा ते न क्लान्तास्तावत्कार्यमुदीरितम् ॥
तन्मनःक्लेशहेतुश्च विफलाय विनिश्चितः ।
तस्मान्न योजयेत् श्रान्तान् वृषभान् कृषिकर्मणि ॥ (Leaf 26, ll. 11–14)

That is, after this prayer to and special worship of the bulls is over, they should be employed in ploughing to such an extent that they are neither exhausted nor fatigued. The cause of their mental anguish would surely lead to failure. Therefore *exhausted bulls should never be employed in ploughing*.

The *Vṛṣabha*s or bulls are divided into four categories called *Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya* and *Śūdra* according to their virtues and bodily features.

Thus the *Brāhmaṇa-jātika Vṛṣabha*s are white-bodied, slightly lofty, roaring deeply and possessing charming eyes. Such bulls are declared to be *suitable for agricultural purposes*.[2]

The bulls of the second category viz. the *Kṣātra-jātika* ones are described as red-bodied, deeply roaring, considerably lofty and full of lustre and strength.[3]

The *Vaiśya-jātika* bulls, adorned with white and red circular marks on their bodies, are not very lofty nor so low.[4]

The bulls of the fourth category viz. the *Śūdra-jātika* ones, being black in colour and not so lofty, are stated here to be angry-natured and possessing a well-shaped hunch.[5]

These four types of bulls are praised as *suitable for agriculture*.[6] Not so long nor thin horns of the bulls, devoid of inequality, are regarded as auspicious and praiseworthy.[7] Their hoofs also should be not so thin nor so long, and

---

2 कृषिकर्मणि ते योग्याः वृषभा वृषवर्धकाः ॥
श्वेताङ्गाः किञ्चिदुत्तुङ्गा वृषभा मञ्जुनेत्रकाः ।
गम्भीरनिनदा ये च ते तु ब्राह्मणजातिकाः ॥ —MS no. 13514, folio 26, lines 20-22.

3 रक्ताङ्गा नितरां तुङ्गा गम्भीरनिनदाश्च ये ।
तेजोबलसमेताश्च ते वृषाः क्षत्रजातिजाः ॥ —*Ibid.*, folio 26, line 1 and folio 27, l. 1.

4 श्वेतरक्ताङ्कनैर्युक्तास्तन्मण्डलविभूषिताः ।
नातितुङ्गा नातिनीचास्ते वृषा वैश्यजातिकाः ॥ —*Ibid.*, folio 27, lines 2-3.

5 कृष्णाङ्गा नातितुङ्गाश्च कोपवेगेन ताडिताः ।
सु——वन्तश्च ते वृषाः शूद्रजातिकाः ॥ —*Ibid.*, folio 27, ll. 4-5.

6 एते सर्वे प्रशस्ताश्च कृषिकर्मणि योग्यकाः । —*Ibid.*, fol. 27, l. 6.

7 नातिदीर्घं न च कृशं वृषशृङ्गद्वयं शुभम् ॥
मिथो वैषम्यहीनं च वृषशृङ्गं प्रशस्यते ॥ —*Ibid.*, fol. 27, ll. 7-8.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

quite equal and firm.[8] Auspicious gait, long tail, neither fatty nor thin body, capacity of carrying loads and delight in work are declared as the *best characteristics of the bulls*.[9] White colour of the hoofs, horns, forehead and tail even with another colour, pleasant look, auspicious or well-shaped turns of the limbs, series of subtle bristles on the body, deep sounding and pleasing eyes are also stated as *good characteristics*.[10] Completely white-bodied or red-bodied bulls are also considered *good*.[11] The sage lays down that such bulls and cows of auspicious characteristics should be tamed by the agriculturists.

On the other hand, red colour, huge horns, lack of lustre and strength, stumbling gait, angry and sleepy mood, thinness of body, smoke-colour, much food, paleness, very low structure, hardness of limbs and cruel sound are declared as the characteristic features of *inauspicious or low type of bulls* which should be avoided.[12]

The section under discussion is entitled as *Saṅgraheṇa go-vṛṣabha-lakṣaṇa-kathana-kramaḥ* and it starts with the mention of both cows as well as bulls.[13]

---

8 खुराश्च वृषभाणां तु न कृशा नातिदीर्घकाः ॥
वैषम्यहीनाश्च तथा दृढा श्लाघ्या विनिश्चिताः । —*Ibid.*, ll. 9-10.

9 शुभा गतिर्दीर्घवालो वृषभानां प्रशस्यते ॥
नातिस्थूला न च कृशाः भारवाहित्वमेव च ।
प्रसक्तत्वं च कार्यकाले वृषाणामुत्तमा गुणाः ॥ —*Ibid.*, ll. 11-13.

10 खुरे विषाणे श्वेतश्च ललाटे पुच्छकेऽपि च ।
वर्णान्तरविभूतिश्च वृषः शुभविवृद्धिदः ॥
रम्यात्मानश्च हृष्टाश्च शुभवर्णसमुज्ज्वलाः ।
शुभावर्तादिसहिताः धनधान्यविवृद्धिदाः ॥
सूक्ष्मरोमावलीव्याप्ता गम्भीरनिनदाश्च ये ।
मनोज्ञनयनोपेता वृषभाः शुभदा मताः ॥ —*Ibid.*, ll. 14-19.

11 सम्पूर्णश्वेतकायाश्च रक्तकायास्तु वा वृषाः ॥
शुभदा धनधान्यादिवृद्धिदाः परिकीर्तिताः । —*Ibid.*, fol. 28, ll. 2-3.

12 रक्तवर्णा महाशृङ्गास्तेजोबलविवर्जिताः ।
स्खलद्गतियुताश्चाऽपि क्रोधनिद्रावशंगताः ॥
कृशाङ्गा धूम्रवर्णाश्च तथा बह्वाशिनश्च ये ।
ये विवर्णाश्च वृषभा नितरां नीचकाश्च ये ॥
कर्कशाङ्गाः क्रूरस्वा वर्ज्यास्ते वृषभाधमाः । —*Ibid.*, fol. 27, ll. 20-23 and fol. 28, line 1.

13 गावश्च वृषभाश्चैव शुभलक्षणभासुराः ॥
शुभदाः स्वामिनां प्रोक्ता देशक्षेमप्रदाश्च ते ।
कृषिकर्मणि ते योग्या वृषभा वृषवर्धकाः ॥ —*Ibid.*, fol. 26, ll. 18-20.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Moreover, no separate treatment of cows is given afterwards. Hence the discussion regarding the types of the bulls and their good and bad characteristics etc. *may safely be inferred to refer to the cows as well.* At the close of this discussion the author ordains that more than a hundred (*paraḥ śatam*) cows should be tamed by the farmers both in villages as well as in towns; they should be nourished by offering grass, water etc. and they should be well protected in all the seasons. It is also pronounced that there remains no doubt about rainfall where a thousand cows (*go-sahasram*) are tamed with affection.[14]

The other manuscript is entitled *Mrga-pakṣi-śāstram* or the Sciences of Beasts and Birds (Acc. No. 13516). Its author is one *Hamsadeva* believed to have flourished in the 13th century A.D. It has in all 163 leaves, 28.5 × 21 cms. in size, written on one side of the paper, extending to about 1800 *granthas*—i.e., double the extent of the previous MS. As the title indicates, it deals with the characteristic features of the different types of beasts and birds. The work starts with the story of *Śaudadeva*, a virtuous and famous king of *Jinapura*. He once set out into the forests for hunting. There he observed the various types of beasts and birds engaged in free movements. He was highly pleased at the sight of these valuable treasures of Nature. He feared that hunting would in due course root out some of these species. Determining to preserve them, he returned to his capital without hunting. The next morning, he expressed before his Scholars' Council his desire to know more about the creatures freely residing in mountains and forests. Consequently poet *Hamsadeva* composed the *Mrgapakṣiśāstram* at the instance of minister *Tārananda*, giving an account of the characteristics, life-span, etc. of the principal species of beasts and birds

The work is divided into two parts. The first part deals with 21 species of beasts, while the second one treats of 15 species of birds. Among these beasts the 12th is *Vṛṣabha* or the bull and the 13th is *Dhenu* or the cow. Folios 51 to 55 deal with the former, while folios 56-57 treat of the latter.

The bulls are described here as creatures of firm feats; white, red, black or smoky in colour or even in mixed colour; having two horns and adorned with a

---

14 अतः सत्कुलसञ्जाता धेनवश्च विशेषतः ॥
कृषीवलैस्तत्र तत्र ग्रामेषु नगरेष्वपि ।
शुभलक्षणसंयुक्ता धेनवस्तु परःशतम् ॥
पालनीयाः कृषिकरैः ग्रामेषु नगरेष्वपि ।
पलाल्तृणनीराद्यैर्लालनैर्बहुरक्षणैः ॥
धर्मार्थकामसिद्धिस्तु धेनूनां पालनाद् भवेत ।
रोगप्रशान्तिश्च तथा बालवृद्धादिरक्षणम् ॥
गोसहस्रं यत्र देशे पाल्यते प्रीतिपूर्वकम् ।
तत्र देशेषु पर्जन्यो वर्षत्येव न संशयः ॥ —*Ibid.*, fol. 28, ll. 16-23 and fol. 29, l. 1.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

long tail; humpy; capable of bearing loads and possessing nice form, lustre and strength.[15] Pronounced as the veritable treasures of the farmers, they are believed to be promoting the welfare of all beings, affectionate towards their masters, calm, resolute, grateful, bulky-bellied, easily trained, mostly having a long testicle, satisfied with sweet varieties of grass, able to endure hunger and thirst and attentive to work.[16] They are stated here to be possessed of good odour, well-behaved, adorned with nice curls of hair, amiable, intelligent and causing growth of prosperity.[17]

The calves are stated here to be born mostly at night and start to eat grass when six months old and after one or two years of age their movements become serious. Then they develop amiable nature and good smell.[18] At the age of 4 years they become adorned with youth and at five they reach the prime of

---

15 बलीवर्दाः सप्तविधा जायन्ते दृढविक्रमाः ।
शुक्ला रक्ताश्च कृष्णाश्च धूम्राः सङ्कीर्णवर्णकाः ॥
शृङ्गद्वयसमायुक्ता दीर्घपुच्छविभूषिताः ।
ककुद्मन्तो भारसहाः रूपतेजोबलान्विताः ॥ —MS. no. 13516, folio 51, lines 17-20.

16 कृषीवलानां निधयः सर्वप्राणिहिते रताः ।
स्वामिवात्सल्यवन्तश्च शान्तात्मानश्च ते मताः ॥
दृढपादसमायुक्ताः कृतज्ञाः स्थूलकुक्षिकाः ।
सुखशिक्षायुताः प्रायो लम्बमुष्काश्च ते मताः ॥
पलालशष्पश्यामाकैरन्यैर्मधुरसैस्तृणैः ।
क्षुत्तृट्पिपासादिसहाः कार्यदक्षाश्च ते मताः ॥
—*Ibid.*, fol. 51, ll. 21-22 and fol. 52, ll. 1-4.

17 शुभगन्धाः शुभाचाराः शुभावर्तविभूषिताः ।
सुशीला बुद्धिमन्तश्च सम्पदुल्लासहेतवः ॥ —*Ibid.*, fol. 52, ll. 5-6.

18 प्रायो निशायां सञ्जाताः वत्साः सुन्दरकायकाः ॥
* * *
षण्मासा वृषपोतास्तु घासभक्षणतत्पराः ॥
ततः पलालश्यामिभक्षणे तत्परा भृशम् ।
नीत्वा क्रमेण प्रथमं वत्सरं च द्वितीयकम् ॥
गम्भीरगमना नित्यं सुन्दराङ्गसमन्विताः ।
सुशीलाः शुभगन्धाश्च नाथसम्पद्विवर्धकाः ॥
—*Ibid.*, fol. 52, ll. 18, 22-24; fol. 53, ll. 1-2.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

youth.[19] Then they become suitable for agriculture.[20] Hemanta and Śiśira are their seasons of passion.[21]

In a way quite different from that of the former work, Hamsadeva mentions here seven categories of the bulls according to their virtues and form *viz. Ukṣan, Balīvarda, Ṛṣabha, Vṛṣa, Anaḍvān, Mahokṣa* and *Saurabheya.*

The *Ukṣan* is stated to be corpulent, amiable, white and short-horned. It has a fair face and a tranquil mind. It can understand the intention of its master from the latter's gestures, is expert in its work, can carry heavy loads, possesses a serious gait and always eats a limited quantity of food. Intelligent and adorned with nice curls of hair, it is, therefore, pronounced to be unpunishable.[22]

The *Balīvarda* has a well-nourished white or red high body, with firm veins, curved horns, a bulky belly and a long tail. Obedient to its master, valiant, fast-moving like an arrow and heaving long sighs, it is scarcely angry. Easily trained and expert in its affairs, it bellows again and again. It is declared to be brave, resolute, always going ahead and capable of carrying heavy loads.[23]

---

19 चतुर्वर्षाः पञ्चवर्षा वृषा यौवनमेदुराः ॥ —*Ibid.*, fol. 52, l. 8.

Also:

चतुर्वर्षवयस्कास्ते यौवनेन विभूषिताः ॥
पञ्चवर्षवयस्कास्तु पूर्णयौवनशालिनः ॥ —*Ibid.*, fol. 53, ll. 3-4.

20 गर्भप्रदाश्च धेनूनां कृषिकार्यार्हका मताः । —*Ibid.*, l. 5.

21 हैमन्तः शिशिरः कालस्त्वेतेषां कामदीपकः । —*Ibid.*, fol. 52, l. 9.

22 उक्षाणस्ते समाख्याताः स्थूलदेहाः सुशीलकाः ।
पूर्णश्वेताङ्गसंयुक्ता ह्रस्वशृङ्गसमन्विताः ॥
सुन्दराननमान्याश्च शान्तचित्ताश्च ते मताः ।
इङ्गितज्ञाः कार्यदक्षा नितरां भारवाहिनः ॥
गम्भीरगमना नित्यं मिताहाराश्च ते मताः ।
अदण्ड्या बुद्धिमन्तश्च शुभावर्तादिभूषिताः ॥ —*Ibid.*, fol. 53, ll. 8-13.

23 बलीवर्दास्तुङ्गदेहा नितरां पुष्टिभासुराः ।
शुक्ला वा रक्तवर्णा वा दृढनाडीसमन्विताः ॥
नितरां रम्यगात्राश्च वक्रशृङ्गसमन्विताः ।
स्थूलोदरा दीर्घपुच्छा यन्तृचित्तानुवर्तिनः ॥
स्वल्पकोपयुताश्चापि पूर्णशौर्यसमन्विताः ।
शरवद्वेगगमना दीर्घनिःश्वासमारुताः ॥
सुखसाध्याः कार्यदक्षाः शश्वद्गर्जनकारिणः ।
अभीरवो दृढपदा घासभक्षणतत्पराः ॥
नितरां भारवाहाश्च पुरोगाश्च प्रकीर्तिताः । —*Ibid.*, ll. 15-23.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

The *Ṛṣabha* type of bulls are pronounced as being black in colour, having long horns and tails and possessing a structure neither so high nor so low. Adorned with full-grown humps and bulky bellies, they are regarded as skilled in understanding others' intention, expert in their work and wrathful and timid by nature, never taking a lead, possessed of memory as regards training, not so lustful and uttering appeasing speech [24]

The fourth type of bulls are the *Vṛṣas*. Bright-skinned, joyous and wrathless, they are stated to be very eager to work; but if punished, they would be highly enraged. Possessing red eyes and short bodies, they are speedy and amiable. Possessed of good odour and nice curls of hair and adorned with firm feats, they can bear hunger, thirst and load.[25]

Anaḍvān is the fifth category of bulls. Patient, stuffed and speedy, it possesses a profound figure of varied colours. Slightly slow in gait, it is easily tamed. Inclined to eating continuously, when struck with sexual passion, it becomes angry and would not hesitate to act cruelly. In youth it becomes full-grown. Possessing a stout but very smooth and well-scented body, devoid of diseases, it is obedient to its master.[26]

Mahokṣa is the sixth type of bull possessing a very lofty white body. It is speedy and powerful. It has a huge hunch and a long navel. Unpunishable

---

24 दीर्घशृङ्गसमायुक्ताः कृष्णास्ते ऋषभा मताः ।
नातितुङ्गा नातिनीचा दीर्घपुच्छसमन्विताः ॥
बृहत्ककुन्मण्डिताश्च स्थूलोदरसमन्विताः ।
इङ्गितज्ञाः कार्यदक्षाः कोपशीलाश्च ते मताः ॥
भीरवस्ते पृष्ठगाश्च शिक्षणे स्मरणान्विताः ।
स्वल्पकामाः मान्त्ववाक्यपरास्ते परिकीर्तिताः ॥ —*Ibid.*, fol. 54, ll. 2-7.

25 वृषास्ते शुद्धवर्णाक्ताः कोपहीना मुदान्विताः ।
कार्यलोलुपचित्ताश्च दण्डनेऽधिककोपनाः ॥
रक्तनेत्रा ह्रस्वकाया वेगवन्तश्च कीर्तिताः ।
सुशीलाः शुभगन्धाश्च दृढविक्रममण्डिताः ॥
क्षुत्तृट्भारसहा नित्यं शुभावर्तादिसंयुताः । —*Ibid.*, ll. 9-13.

26 अनड्वान् स तु विज्ञेयो धीरः सत्त्वजवान्वितः ॥
नानावर्णसमोपेतो गम्भीराकृतिमण्डितः ।
किञ्चिन्मन्दगतिश्चाऽपि सुखसाध्यश्च कीर्तितः ॥
सन्ताताहारलोलश्च कामवेगेन ताडितः ।
कुपितः क्रूरकार्योक्तो यौवनेऽधिकपुष्टिभाक् ॥
दृढकायो रोगहीनो नाथकार्यानुकूलकृत् ।
नितरां श्लक्ष्णदेहश्च शुभगन्धादिसंयुतः ॥ —*Ibid.*, ll. 15-21.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

and gross-bodied, intelligent and tolerant, long-tailed and huge-headed, it is ready to work hard and go ahead. Uncruel, strong and contented by nature, it has a well-shaped body and it likes decoration. It would enhance its master's pleasure.[27]

The seventh and last category of bulls according to *Hamsadeva* is *Saurabheya*. Its characteristics mentioned here are nobility, very lofty (i.e. 4 hands or even more in height) and bulky body, white skin, very speedy gait, tranquil mind, strength and lustre, bellowing, long navel, lack of cruelty, softness of body, massive flesh, charming but impetuous appearance, suitability for royal ride and obedience to the master.[28]

In this way, there are various types of bulls characterised by a variety of qualities.[29] Those short-limbed vicious ones that are untamable, dreadful, devoid of speed and lustre, hostile to one another, reviling to other creatures and as such whose activities are censurable, are pronounced as *unsuitable for agricultural actions*. They are, therefore, always to be avoided by the agriculturists.[30]

---

27 महोक्षास्ते समाख्याता नितरां तुङ्गदेहकाः ।
शुद्धवर्णा वेगपादा नितरां बलशालिनः ।
बृहत्ककुत्समायुक्ता लम्बनाभीलताश्च ते ॥
अदण्ड्याः स्थूलदेहाश्च मेधासारसमन्विताः ।
क्षमायुक्ता दीर्घपुच्छा महाकार्यप्रयोजिताः ॥
फलदाः स्वामिनां स्थूलमस्तकाश्च पुरोगमाः ।
गम्भीराकृतयः क्रौर्यविहीनाः सत्त्वमण्डिताः ॥
पूर्णकामाः सद्गुणाश्च राजवाहाश्च ते मताः ।
अलङ्कृतिप्रिया नित्यं स्वामिनां सुखवर्धकाः ॥ —*Ibid.*, fol. 54, line last; fol 55, ll. 1-8.

28 सौरभेया महावंश्या नितरां तुङ्गदेहकाः ।
चतुष्करोन्नतियुताः केचिदधिकोन्नताः ॥
शुद्धवर्णा महावेग-गतयः शान्तमानसाः ।
बलतेजःसारयुताः सुखसाध्याश्च ते मताः ॥
श्रमकार्येषु योक्तव्या महानादप्रदायकाः ।
नितरां स्थूलदेहाश्च लम्बनाभीलताश्च ते ॥
अक्रूराः श्लक्ष्णदेहाश्च दृढमांसा मनोहराः ।
प्रचण्डा राजवाहाश्च यन्तृचित्तानुवर्तिनः ॥ —*Ibid.*, fol. 55, ll. 10-17.

29 एवं बहुविधा गावो नानागुणसमुज्ज्वलाः । —*Ibid.*, fol. 55, l. 18.

30 असाध्या भीकराश्चण्डा दुर्गुणैश्च समन्विताः ॥
क्रियानर्हा निन्द्यकार्या जवतेजोविवर्जिताः ।
परस्परविरोधाश्च प्राणिभर्त्सनतत्पराः ॥
ह्रस्वगात्राश्च ते वर्ज्याः सन्ततं तु कृषीवलैः । —*Ibid.*, ll. 19-22.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

The bulls retain their youth up to the age of 12 years, whereafter, fatigued due to old age, they lose flesh, lustre and speed and consequently they should not be employed in agriculture.[31] 20 years is pronounced to be the highest limit of their life. From the view-point of actions and species they are placed in the *Rājasottama* category of animals.[32]

The 13th *Śreṇī* entitled *Dhenu-guṇādi-varṇanam* treats of the cows.

The characteristics of the cows are similar to those of the bulls. Of holy sight, they are declared as possessing sharp intelligence.[33] White, red, blue or black in colour, they also possess a mixed colour. Having long tails and short horns, they are full of milk.[34] The well-nourished bodies of these slowly moving creatures are quite fair. Eating grass, corn, etc. they rejoice in the welfare of all creatures.[35] Affectionate towards their calves, they enhance the well-being of the human race. Mostly having a short hump and swift speed, they possess good smell, good conduct and nice circular marks on their bodies. As such they are pronounced here as worthy of circumambulations and salutations, for they are believed to sanctify the very earth.[36]

At the age of four years the cows attain their youth and when five years old, they become charming with full-fledged youth.[37] Hemanta and Śiśira are the seasons of their sexual passion.[38] During pregnancy their movements become

---

31 द्वादशावधि तेषां तु यौवनं परिकीर्तितम् ॥
ततः परं हीनमांसा हीनतेजोजवा मताः ।
ततस्तु जरया क्रान्ता न योज्याः सस्यकर्मणि ॥ —*Ibid.*, II. 23-25.

32 वृषभाणां पर चायुर्विंशतिः परिकीर्तिता ।
क्रियाजातिप्रभेदेन ते मता राजसोत्तमाः ॥ —*Ibid.*, fol. 56, II. 1-2.

33 वृषभैस्तुल्यशीलादिसंयुताः पुण्यदर्शनाः ॥
धेनवो द्विविधा लोके जायन्ते सूक्ष्मबुद्धयः ॥ —*Ibid.*, II. 7-8.

34 शुक्ला रक्ताश्च नीलाश्च कृष्णाः सङ्कीर्णवर्णकाः ।
दीर्घपुच्छाः क्षीरपूर्णा ह्रस्वशृङ्गैश्च मण्डिताः ॥ —*Ibid.*, II. 9-10.

35 पुष्टिभाजो मन्दचाराः सुन्दराङ्गयश्च ता मताः ।
तृणस्तम्बादिभोजिन्यः सर्वप्राणिहिते रताः ॥ —*Ibid.*, II. 11-12.

36 स्ववत्सवात्सल्यमान्या नराणां क्षेमवर्धकाः ।
प्रायो ह्रस्वककुद्युक्ता जववेगसमन्विताः ॥
शुभगन्धाः शुभाचाराः शुभावर्ताग्रलङ्कृताः ।
प्रदक्षिणप्रणामार्ह-शीला भूपावना मताः ॥ —*Ibid.*, II. 13-16.

37 चतुर्वर्षे तु धेनूनां यौवनं परिकीर्तितम् ।
पञ्चवर्षास्तेन पूर्णाः सौन्दर्येण च मण्डिताः ॥ —*Ibid.*, II. 17-18.

38 हैमन्तः शिशिरः कालो धेनूनां कामदायकः । —*Ibid.*, I. 19.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

slow, their mouths are foamy, their eyes turn round, they eat less and they get long sleep.[39] They bear the foetus for full ten months before delivery.[40] Generally cows are believed to deliver four or five off-springs in all.[41] Calm-minded and kind, they are regarded as ornaments of the house.[42]

The author has divided cows into two categories viz. *Gos* and *Dhenus*. Their characteristics may be enumerated in a comparative table as under :

	Go	*Dhenu*
(1)	One pure colour all throughout.[43]	Varied colours : White, red and black at the back, face and belly.[44]
(2)	Always cheerful.[45]	—
(3)	Having short horns.[46]	Having some-what lofty horns.[47]
(4)	Having a body not so lofty nor so low.[48]	Having a some-what lofty body.[49]
(5)	Having attractive eyes.[50]	—
(6)	Having an attractive face.[51]	—

---

39 स्वल्पाहारा भ्रमन्नेत्रा गर्भश्रमसमन्विताः ।
मन्दप्रचाराः फेनास्याः शश्वन्निद्रापरायणाः ॥ —*Ibid.*, fol. 52, ll. 15-16.
and
मन्दचारा रम्यकाया निद्राध्यानादितत्पराः ॥
मृदुभक्ष्याः पयःपानासक्ता मुदितमानसाः । —*Ibid.*, fol. 57, ll.6-7.

40 नीत्वैवं मासदशकं सुवते धेनवः सुतान् । —*Ibid.*, fol. 52, line 17.
and
नीत्वैवं मासदशकं सुवते वत्सडिम्भकम् ॥ —*Ibid.*, fol. 57, l. 8.

41 प्रायो गावः चतुःपञ्चपुत्रदाः परिकीर्तिताः । —*Ibid.*, fol. 57, l. 9.

42 शान्तचित्ताः कौर्यहीना गृहाणां भूषणा मताः ॥ —*Ibid.*, l. 10.

43 गावस्तास्तु समाख्याताः शुद्धवर्णविभूषिताः ॥ —*Ibid.*, l. 13.

44 नानावर्णसमोपेता धेनवस्ताः प्रकीर्तिताः ।
पृष्ठभागे मुखे कुक्षौ श्वेता रक्ताश्च कृष्णकाः ॥ —*Ibid.*, ll. 21-22.

45 सन्ततं हृष्टचित्ताश्च । —*Ibid.*, . 14.

46 ह्रस्वशृङ्गसमन्विताः । —*Ibid.*

47 किञ्चित्तुङ्गशृङ्गविभूषिताः । —*Ibid.*, l. 23.

48 नातितुङ्गा नातिनीचाः —*Ibid.*, l. 15.

49 ईषत्तुङ्गशरीराश्च —*Ibid.*, l. 24.

50 मञ्जुनेत्रमनोहराः ॥ —*Ibid.*, l. 15.

51 मञ्जुवक्त्राः —*Ibid.*, l. 16.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

(7)	Moving slowly.[52]	Some-what speedy.[53]
(8)	Possessing a long tail.[54]	Having a very long tail.[55]
(9)	Lustrous and strong.[56]	Lustrous and strong.[57]
(10)	Producing auspicious soundings.[58]	Producing deep soundings.[59]
(11)	Like decorations.[60]	—
(12)	Always eating limited food.[61]	—
(13)	Having a very soft touch.[62]	Possessing a soft body.[63]
(14)	Their bodies become well-nourished in youth.[64]	—
(15)	—	Devoid of diseases and tranquil-minded.[65]
(16)	—	Devoid of anger even when fatigued by labour and as such unworthy of any punishment and enhancing the master's happiness.[66]
(17)	—	Possessing a strong memory.[67]
(18)	—	Affectionate towards the master.[68]

---

52 मन्दचाराः —*Ibid.*

53 किञ्चिज्जवयुताः —*Ibid.*, l. 23.

54 दीर्घपुच्छसमन्विताः —*Ibid.*, l. 16.

55 नितरां दीर्घपुच्छाश्च —*Ibid.*, fol. 58, l.1.

56 तेजःसत्त्वसमोपेताः —*Ibid.*, fol. 57, l. 17.

57 तेजःसत्त्वविभूषिताः ॥ —*Ibid.*, fol. 58, l. 2.

58 शुभनादाश्च ता मताः ॥ —*Ibid.*, fol. 57, l. 17.

59 गम्भीरध्वनिकण्ठकाः ॥ —*Ibid.*, l. 24.

60 अलङ्कृतिप्रियाः —*Ibid.*, l. 18.

61 नित्यं स्वल्पाहाराः प्रकीर्तिताः । —*Ibid.*

62 मृदुस्पर्शाश्च नितराम् —*Ibid.*, l. 19.

63 श्लक्ष्णदेहाश्च ता मताः । —*Ibid.*, fol. 58, l. 1.

64 यौवने पुष्टदेहकाः ॥ —*Ibid.*, fol. 57, l. 19.

65 रोगहीनाः शान्तचित्ताः —*Ibid.*, fol. 58, l. 2.

66 श्रमेऽपि कोपहीनाश्चादण्ड्याः क्षेमविवर्धकाः । —*Ibid.*, l. 3.

67 दृढस्मृतिसमोपेताः —*Ibid.*, l. 4.

68 स्वामिवात्सल्यबन्धुराः ॥ —*Ibid.*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

(19) — Timid in nature.[69]

(20) — Honoured due to auspicious smell etc.[70]

At the close of the description of the distinctive features of the two categories of cows, the author declares that there are different kinds of cows divided according to their qualities, colour, actions etc. but mostly all of them are always confirmedly uncruel, bent on moving at free will, devoted to the welfare of all creatures and as such *they are as good as religious deities.* Being promoters of health etc. of their masters they deserve to be protected with effort by men of love and faith.[71] The age of youth and span of life of the cows are declared to be the same as those of the bulls, and they also are classed as *Rājasottama* creatures according to their actions and species.[72]

In spite of the supreme importance of agriculture in ancient Indian culture, we rarely come across ancient Sanskrit works on agriculture. In the present paper we got acquainted with the *Kāśyapīya-kṛṣi-sūkti*, an unpublished Sanskrit treatise on agriculture. It will not be out of place here now to acquaint ourselves with another Sanskrit text on Ancient Indian Agriculture already published as early as 1960 A.D. It is *Kṛṣi-parāśara* by the sage *Parāśara*, edited and translated into English by Girija Prasanna *Majumdar* and Sures Chandra *Banerji* and published by the Asiatic Society, Calcutta as work no. 285 of the Bibliotheca Indica, with a short foreword by Dr. S. K. *De*. It consists of 243 verses (60 pages). As stated in the Introduction to this edition, Jogesh Chandra *Roy* places the *Kṛṣi-parāśara* between the 6th and the 8th centuries A.D.[73] It will be interesting and not out of place to mention here the references to the *go* (masculine and feminine) made by *Parāśara* during the course of discussions.

---

69 किञ्चिद्भीरुस्वभावाश्च —*Ibid.*, l. 5.

70 शुभगन्धादिमानिताः । —*Ibid.*

71 एवं बहुविधा गावो गुणवर्णक्रियादिभिः ॥
सर्वास्ताः प्रायशो नित्यं क्रौर्यहीना विनिश्चिताः ।
स्वेच्छासञ्चारशीलाश्च सर्वप्राणिहिते रताः ॥
धर्मदेवीस्वरूपिण्यः स्वाम्यारोग्यादिदायकाः ।
यत्नतो रक्षितव्याश्च प्रीतिश्रद्धान्वितैर्नरैः ॥ —*Ibid.*, ll. 6-10.

72 सर्वासामपि धेनूनां वृषवत् यौवनं वयः ।
क्रियाजातिप्रभेदेन ते मता राजसोत्तमाः ॥ —*Ibid.*, ll. 11-12.

73 Majumdar Girija Prasanna and Banerji Sures Chandra (ed. and transl.), *Kṛṣi-parāśara*, Bibliotheca Indica no. 285, published by the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, 1960, Introduction p. ix; also Roy Jogesh Chandra, Āmāder Jyotisī O Jyotisa (in Bengali), Calcutta, Śaka 1825, p. 30.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

It is clearly stated here that the *gos* i.e. the cows and the bulls should be attended upon personally; they would deteriorate if not properly supervised even for a while.[74] The farmer is ordained to look to their comforts,[75] Cultivation has to be performed *in such a way as the bulls are not overburdened.*[76] Even a rich harvest obtained in that way would soon be destroyed by the sighs of the bulls.[77] They have to be offered nourishing food and be allowed to graze freely in the morning and the evening.[78] The cow-shed should be fairly spacious, well-built and thoroughly clean.[79] The cows and bulls there should also be kept quite clean.[80] The following, being injurious to the health of the cows, have to be avoided in the shed:

(1) Bell-metal, (2) water kept in a bell-metal vessel, (3) hot scum of boiled rice, (4) water with which fish has been washed, (5) carding of cotton, (6) a broom, (7) a pestle, (8) remnants of food, (9) goats, (10) cleaning of cows' excrements by cow's urine.[81]

---

74 पितुरन्तःपुरं दद्यान्मातुर्दद्यान्महानसम् ।
गोषु चात्मसमं दद्यात् स्वयमेव कृषिं व्रजेत् ॥
कृषिर्गावो वणिग्विद्याः स्त्रियो राजकुलानि च ।
क्षणेनैकेन सीदन्ति मुहूर्तमनवेक्षणात् ॥ —*Kṛṣi-parāśara, op. cit.*, verses 80-81.

75 **गोहितः** क्षेत्रगामी च कालज्ञो बीजतत्परः ।
वितन्द्रः सर्वशस्याढ्यः कृषको **नाऽवसीदति** ॥ —*Ibid.*, verse 83.

76 कृषिं तु तादृशीं कुर्याद्यथा वाहान्न पीडयेत् । 84^{ab}

77 वाहपीडार्जितं शस्यं गर्हितं सर्वकर्मसु ॥ 84^{cd}
वाहपीडार्जितं शस्यं फलितं च चतुर्गुणम् ।
वाहनिःश्वासवातेन तद्द्रुतं च विनश्यति ॥ 85

78 गुडकैर्यवसैर्धूमैस्तथाऽन्यैरपि पोषणैः ।
वाहाः क्वचिन्न सीदन्ति सायं प्रातश्च चारणात् ॥86

79 गोशाला सुदृढा यस्य शुचिर्गोमयवर्जिता ।
तस्य वाहा विवर्धन्ते पोषणैरपि वर्जिताः ॥ 87
पञ्चपदा तु गोशाला गवां वृद्धिकरी स्मृता । 89^{ab}

80 गोशकृन्मूत्रलिप्ताङ्गा वाहा यत्र दिने दिने ।
निःसरन्ति गवां स्थानात् तत्र किं पोषणादिभिः ॥ 88

81 कांस्यं कांस्योदकं चैव तप्तमण्डं क्षपोदकम् ।
कार्पासशोधनं चैव गोस्थाने गोविनाशकृत् ॥ 90
संमार्जनीं च मुसलमुच्छिष्टं गोनिकेतने ।
कृत्वा गोनाशमाप्नोति तत्राऽजबन्धनाद् ध्रुवम् । 91
गोमूत्रजालकेनैव यत्राऽवस्करमोचनम् ।
कुर्वन्ति गृहमेधिन्यस्तत्र का वाहवासना ॥ 92

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

A well-wisher of the cows is ordained not to part with cow-dung on Sunday, Tuesday, and Saturday.[82] A light has to be put in the shed at sunset.[83]

An important injunction regarding the number of bulls to be employed in cultivation is also note-worthy. *The best way of cultivation is to yoke 8 bulls together to a ploughshare.* Those who yoke 6 bulls are regarded as professional cultivators. The agriculturists employing 4 bulls to a plough are cruel, while those yoking 2 bulls to a plough are pronounced as *gavāśin*s or beef-eaters ![84] Similarly in the employment of ploughs also one has to be very careful. *The goddess of wealth always resides there where 10 ploughs are employed for cultivation.* Wealth is there in employing 5 ploughs. Sufficient food may be obtained by employing 3 ploughs and the employer of only one plough would have in his fate nothing but debt. The employer of 2 ploughs would reap so much as may maintain himself; he would not be able to spare any food for being offered to the manes, deities and guests.[85]

There is a clear statement regarding the choice of bulls for cultivation. Three types of bulls are regarded as praiseworthy for the purpose : either black or red or black-and-red. The sides of their faces are ordained to be besmeared with either butter or ghee before taking them to the fields.[86] Bulls with weak hips and tails and ears cut off as also all-white ones are not to be employed in cultivation.[87]

---

82 विलङ्घि गोमयस्याऽपि रविभौमशनेर्दिने ।
न कारयेद्भ्रमेणाऽपि गोवृद्धिं यदि वाञ्छति ॥ 93
वारत्रयं परित्यज्य दद्यादन्येषु गोमयम् ।
शनिभौमार्कवारेषु गवां हानिकरः स्मृतः ॥ 94

83 सन्ध्यायां तु गवां स्थाने दीपो यत्र न दीयते ।
स्थानं तत्कमलाहीनं वीक्ष्य क्रन्दन्ति गोगणाः ॥ 95

84 हलमष्टगवं प्रोक्तं षड्गवं व्यवहारिकम् ।
चतुर्गवं नृशंसानां द्विगवं तु गवाशिनाम् ॥ 96

85 नित्यं दशहले लक्ष्मीर्नित्यं पञ्चहले धनम् ।
नित्यं तु त्रिहले भक्तं नित्यमेकहले ऋणम् ॥ 97
आत्मपोषणमात्रं तु द्विहलेन च सर्वदा ।
पितृदेवातिथीनां च नाऽन्नदाने भवेत् क्षमः ॥ 98

86 कृष्णौ वृषौ हलश्लाघ्यौ रक्तौ वा कृष्णलोहितौ ।
मुखपार्श्वौ तयोर्लेप्यौ नवनीतैर्घृतेन वा ॥ 134

87 वृषो व्यर्थकटिर्वर्ज्यश्छिन्नलाङ्गूलकर्णकः ।
सर्वशुक्लस्तथा वर्ज्यः कृषकैर्हलकर्मणि ॥ 141

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Certain omens also are mentioned by *Parāśara* regarding agriculture. For instance, if a bull falls down while ploughing, it is suspected that the man would die of fever and dysentery. Like-wise, in case the bull suddenly runs while driving the plough, the farmer would suspect failure of agriculture and would sustain physical ailment. On the other hand, the bellowing and licking the nose on the part of a bull at the outset of ploughing indicates four-fold harvest; while the bull's passing of dung in course of ploughing implies increase of crops and passing of urine suggests flood.[88]

A special *cow-festival* is also described in this work. It is to be celebrated on *Laguḍa-pratipad*, the first day of the month of Kārttika. It might be the first day of the dark half of Kārttika. On that day the cows (and bulls) are to be worshipped tying the Śyāma-creepers to their horns and besmearing them with turmeric mixed with oil. The chief bull is to be decorated with saffron, sandal-paste, oil and turmeric etc. and then it is taken in procession round the village amidst vocal and instrumental music. The other cows (and bulls) also are decorated and marked with heated iron and their tails, hair and ears are slightly cut off. The cowherds raise *laguḍas* or clubs in their hands while moving in the procession. This procession is taken out in order to avert evil to the cows. It is believed that by the celebration of this festival the entire bovine class doubtlessly becomes healthy and free from diseases for one year.[89]

---

88 हलप्रवाहकाले तु गौरेकः प्रपतेद्यदि ।
ज्वरातिसाररोगेण मानुषो म्रियते ध्रुवम् ॥ 148
हले प्रवाहमाणे तु वृषो धावन् यदा व्रजेत् ।
कृषिभङ्गो भवेत्तस्य पीडा वाऽपि शरीरजा ॥ 149
हलप्रवाहमात्रं तु गौरेको नर्दते यदा ।
नासालीढां प्रकुर्वीत तदा शस्यं चतुर्गुणम् ॥ 150
हले प्रवाहमाणे तु शकृन्मूत्रं भवेद्यदा ।
शस्यवृद्धिः शकृत्पाते मूत्रे वन्या प्रजायते ॥ 151

89 गोपूजां कार्तिके कुर्याल्लगुडप्रतिपत्तिथौ ।
बद्ध्वा श्यामलतां शृङ्गे लिप्त्वा तैलहरिद्रया ॥ 99
कुङ्कुमैश्चन्दनैश्चापि कृत्वा चाऽङ्गे विलेपनम् ।
उद्यम्य लगुडं हस्ते गोपालाः कृतभूषणाः ॥ 100
ततो वाद्यैश्च गीतैश्च मण्डयित्वाऽम्बरादिभिः ।
भ्रामयेयुर्वृषं मुख्यं ग्रामे गोविघ्नशान्तये ॥ 101
गवामङ्गे ततो दद्यात् कार्तिकप्रथमे दिने ।
तैलं हरिद्रया युक्तं मिलित्वा कृषकैः सह ॥ 102

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

To summarise the account in the three ancient works, proper care should be taken of the cow-family, their comforts should be maintained and the bulls should never be given over exertion in cultivation.

तप्तलौहं दिने तस्मिन् गवामङ्गेषु दापयेत् ।
छेदनं च प्रकुर्वीत लाङ्गूलकचकर्णयोः ॥ 103
सर्वा गोजातयः सुस्था भवन्त्येतेन तद्गृहे ।
नानाव्याधिविनिर्मुक्ता वर्षमेकं न संशयः ॥ 104

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

INDIAN EXPANSION IN SOUTH-EAST ASIA : A STUDY IN ECONOMIC FACTORS

By

VIJAY KUMAR THAKUR, Patna (Bihar)

The establishment of Indianised states in South-East Asia has been explained in terms of a number of diverse theories, a majority of which are sadly out of tune with a phenomena which was so unique in its nature. In the ancient times we have hardly any example of cultural domination of one country over the other, except that of India's influence over her Asian neighbours and to explain such an unprecedented event just on the basis of one theory or other is highly improbable. The present paper is an attempt to find out the raison d'etre of this colonial[1] development.

Indian trade contact with the western parts of South East Asia goes back to prehistoric times.[2] The nationalist historians of India have emphasised that this trading relation and the subsequent import of culture can be explained in terms of Indian enterprise alone.[3] But this is a myth and at the outset it must be pointed out that the Malays were *per excellence* a sea-going people and evidences are not wanting that they resorted to the ports of India and Ceylon[4] in the same manner as the Indians.

References to South East Asian countries in Indian literature are not common, rather they are purely incidental allusions both in Sanskrit classics and Tamil poetry.[5] The *Rāmāyaṇa* speaks of *Yavadvīpa* or the island of gold and silver, *Suvarṇadvīpa* or golden Island and *Suvarṇabhūmi* or Land of Gold. These terms have been equated by scholars as regional names for Java and Sumatra.[6] The *Vāyu purāṇa* refers to *Malayadvīpa* which has also been equated with Sumatra by Sir Braddell.[7] But these references together with the Jātaka

---

1 Colony does not mean, as in modern sense, a conquered foreign territory exploited of its material resources for the benefit of the conquering country. It is used in its primary sense as the settlement of the emigrants from one country in a foreign and with no political implication.

2 Hall, D. G. E., *A History of South East Asia*, 1968, p. 12.

3 *Cf.* Mookerji, R. K., *Indian Shipping*, 1912; Majumdar, R. C., *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East*, Vol. 1; *Campā*, 1927, Vol. II; *Suvarṇadvīpa*, 1937-38.

4 Hall, D. G. E., *op. cit.*, p. 13.

5 Paul Wheatley, *The Golden Khersonese*, 1961, pp. 176-84.

6 Levi, Sylvain, " Pour l'historie du Rāmāyaṇa ", *Journal Asiatique*, January-February 1918, pp. 80ff.

7 Wheatley, *op. cit.*, pp. 178-79.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

tales of seamen tell us precisely nothing about the spread of Indian culture in that direction.[8] An attempt has been made, however, to find in a passage of the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya some proof to suggest that the colonisation by India dates back to the second half of the 4th century B.C. The passage in question recommends a king to people an old or a new territory by seizing the territory of another or deporting the surplus population of his own.[9] This hardly suggests the colonisation of South East Asia in that period. This Kauṭilyan dictum probably refers to only internal shifting of the population the best example of which was the deportation of the people of Kaliṅga by Aśoka.[10] Moreover, the original date ascribed to the compilation of the *Arthaśāstra*, namely, c. 300 B.C., is not universally accepted[11] and its defunctness has been proved beyond doubt by Trautman in his recent study of this text.[12] On the basis of certain Chinese texts, R. C. Majumdar seems to hold that the colonisation of South East Asia began in the second century B.C.[13] But the picture which emerges from a study of the archaeological remains of the different South East Asian sites is somewhat different. In Burma[14] there is no trace of Indian penetration before c. A.D. 500, the date of the fragments of the Pali canon found at Môza and Maungun, on the ancient site of Prome.[15] Similarly the sites of Phra Pathom and Phong Tuk[16] have yielded the substructures of edifices and Buddhist sculptures in Gupta and post-Gupta styles,[17] and also a bronze statuette of the Buddha that was first considered to belong to the Amrāvatī school[18] and therefore it can be dated back to the third or the fourth century A.D.

---

8 The *Niddesa*, a Pāli cononical text which dates to the first centuries of the Christian era also enumerates a number of Sanskritised place names that Lévi Sylvain has identified with localities of Farther India (Lévi, "Ptolémée, le Niddesaet la Bṛhatkathā", *Etudes Asiatiques*, Vol. II, 1925, pp. 1-55).

9 Coedes, *The Indianised States of Southeast Asia*, 1968, p. 16.

10 Rock *Edict* XIII (cf. Sircar, D. C., *Select Inscription*, Vol. I, 1942, pp. 35-40).

11 Louis Finot also disposes off this theory on the basis of the date of *Arthaśāstra* (Les Origines de la colonisation indienne en Indochine", *Bulletin del Ecode Francaise d'Extrême-Orient*, XII, 8, pp. 1-4.

12 Trautman, *Kauṭilya and the Arthaśāstra : A Statistical Investigation of the Authorship and Evolution of the Text*, 1971. The lack of any concrete reference to Indian expansion in the south east asia in Indian literature can be explained on the basis that the ancient Indians were averse to writing their history.

13 *Indian Culture in South East Asia*, 1969, p. 3.

14 Apart from the religious mission of the Buddhist monks. Sona and Uttara, which Aśoka sent to *Suvarṇabhūmi* in the 3rd Century B.C.

15 Coedes, G., *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*, 1968, pp. 62-63.

16 *Ibid.*, p. 63.

17 Coedes, "Une rove de la Loi avec inscription en pāli provenent du site de P'ra Pathom", *Artibus Asiae*, XIX, p. 221.

18 d'Ancona, M. L., "Amrāvatī Ceylon and the Three 'Imported Bronzes'", *Art Bulletin*, XXXIV, 1952.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

but that too is considerably later. The Chinese tradition places the founding of the kingdom of Fu-nan by the Brāhmaṇa Kauṇḍinya in Cambodia in the 1st century A.D. China, however, entered into relations with this kingdom in the 3rd century A.D. and the oldest of the four Sanskrit inscriptions found here dates back to this time.[19] Even the Indian influence in Campā on the coast of present day Vietnam, cannot be dated earlier than 4th century A.D.[20] In the archipelago too, the Sanskrit inscriptions of Mūlavarman in the region of Kutei, Borneo and of Pūrṇavarman, in the western part of Java, can be dated back to the first half of the 5th century A.D.[21] However, a few Buddha images scattered in this part can be dated to 4th-5th centuries.[22]

So not even a single archaeological finding in South East Asia connected with India can be dated before the second century A.D. Incidently, Ptolemy, who flourished in the 2nd century A.D., refers to a number of Sanskritised names in trans-Gangetic India.[23] Contrary to this, the earlier classical writers and texts like Pliny, the Elder, Pomponius Mela and the Periplus of the Erythrean Sea, were only vaguely aware of this region.[24] Thus it seems that the Indian colonisation started with a bang in the second and third centuries of our era and came to fruition in the fourth and fifth.

By the second century A.D. the colonial movement seems to have started. Bnt here it must be pointed out that a number of ancient law-givers' have imposed sanctions against sea voyages.[25] Why was it that the ancient Indians ignored this *śāstric* injunction and travelled to South East Asia ? One of the earliest theories tried to explain this expansion in terms of the wave of Indian emigration due to increase in population on the Indian mainland.[26] The contenders of this theory quote the Kauṭilyan dictum, that the citizens should be shifted to new contres if there is an increase in population,[27] in support of their hypothesis. But the reference is all too vogue. Moreover, the original date ascribed to the compilation of the *Arthaśāstra*, namely c 300 B.C., is not universally accepted and its defunctness has been proved beyond doubt by Trautman in his recent study of Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*.[28] Again, there is no evidence to suggest that the excess population was transported to foreign lands; the shifting of population

19 Coedes, *The Indianized States of South East Asia*, p. 40.
20 *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.
21 *Ibid.*, p. 18.
22 *Ibid.*
23 Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
24 *Ibid.*, p. 14.
25 Kane, P. V., *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. III, pp. 933-38.
26 Majumdar, R. C., *Hindu Colonies in the Far East*, 1963, p. 8.
27 Coedes, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
28 Trautman, *op. cit.*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

probably took place within the country itself, the best example of which was the deportation of the people of Kaliṅga by Aśoka.[29]

Some scholars have suggested that the bloody conquest of Kaliṅga on the eastern coast of India by Aśoka in the third century B.C. was responsible for the colonisation of South East Asia.[30] According to this theory the Aśokan invasion unsettled the inhabitants of Kaliṅga and presumably provoked an exodus of population. But we have no evidence of such a movement and the Indian influence does not begin to show itself in South East Asia until several centuries later. At most, it can be argued that the fugitives, if there were any, opened the way to a more important later emigration.

The Kuṣāṇa invasion of India in the 1st century A.D. is also regarded as a probable cause for the migration of the Indian population to South East Asia.[31] If accepted, this is a chronologically more suitable theory. According to this theory, the Yueh-chinomads, who gained control over Bactria shortly after 100 B.C.,[32] had a tendency to move southwards. In the first century A.D. they moved towards India and captured the Punjab and the northern part of the Gangetic plain.[33] In A.D. 78 their leader, Kaṇiṣka ruled much of north India from his capital Peśāwara. S. Lévi regards the effect of this Kuṣāṇa victory as a cause of the colonisation of South East Asia. Both, Hall[34] and Majumdar, have rightly rejected this view. Dr. Majumdar thinks that the Kuṣāṇa influence could not cross Banaras.[35]

One set of scholars suggest that the southern campaigns of Samudragupta led to an exodus of the population from that region.[36] Samudragupta is called the victor of an island in the Allahabad *praśasti*. Probably this island was situated in South East Asia which was colonised by Samudragupta. But this theory is not supported by any evidence. Here it is worthwhile to quote R. C. Majumdar, " There was ample space in India itself for the refugees to take shelter, and it is therefore difficult to regard the foreign conquest as a sufficient cause, by itself, for a large scale migration to a distant land beyond sea. Similarly the conquest of Samudragupta in the south was more an assertion of suzerainty than any actual subjugation ".[37] Equally vague and hypothetical is the theory propounded by certain linguists. There seems to be a similarity between the

29 R. E. XII, *Cf.* Sircar, D. C., *op. cit.*, pp. 35-40.
30 Coedes, *op. cit.*, p. 19.
31 Levi, S., " Kanishka et Śātavāhana ", *Journal Asiatique*, January-March, 1936, p. 94.
32 Before 100 B.C. if. A.D. 78 is taken to be the date of Kaniṣka's accession.
33 Majumdar, R. C., (Ed.), *The Age of Imperial Unity*, 1960, p. 141.
34 Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
35 Majumdar, R. C., *Ancient India*, 1968, p. 122.
36 Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
37 *Ancient Indian Colonization in South East Asia*, p. 15.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

languages of pre-Āryan India and ancient Indonesia and Indochain. On this basis it has been suggested that the Āryan invasion led to an exodus of the aborigines and it were they who ultimately colonised South East Asia. But this theory is bad hypothesis and worse history.

Another hypothesis is that the high-caste Indian adventurers were allowed to seek their fortunes overseas and they were mainly responsible for the spread of Indian culture in South East Asia.[38] This idea is not supported by facts and the most that we can do is not to reject it out of hand. Again, the propagators of Indian culture are thought to have been Indian intellectuals who visited South East Asia and introduced manuals of ritual and technical treatises there or the natives who came to India, stayed there for a while and returned to their own countries.[39] Undoubtedly people of this kind played an important role in the later stages of Indianization, but for a beginning they were too minor a factor to be considered. Moreover, their travels suggest an existing continuous relationship.

There is an important set of three theories which are also concerned with immigration: They may be labeled as the "Vaiśya hypothesis', 'the Kṣatriya hypothesis' and 'the Brāhmaṇa hypothesis'. The first hypothesis which was propounded by N. J. Krom suggests that Indian penetration was peaceful, and it began with traders who settled and married native women, thereby introducing Indian culture.[40] In this way, he suggested, the Indonesians voluntarily accepted the higher Hindu civilisation. Coedes has elaborated this theory.[41] The spread of the Indian culture came as a result of an intensification of Indian trade with South East Asia in the early centuries of the Christian era. Coedes does not support the theory of mass emigration of fugitives from India, but sees Indian trading settlements arising in South East Asian ports, which fascilitated the arrival of more cultivated elements, priests and literati who disseminated Indian culture. Consequently the Indians undertook innumerable voyages for commerce in the Eastern countries such as Java, Sumatra, Malaya and Siam which were regarded as the veritable *El Dorado*, which constantly alluded enterprising traders by promising immense riches to them. This view is reflected in the name *Suvarṇadvīpa* or *Suvarṇabhūmi* (Island of Gold or Land of Gold respectively) which was applied to this vast region of the countries of Indo-Chinese Peninsula and Malaya Peninsula as suggested By R. C. Majumdar.[42] The desire to acquire immense gold provided a potent stimulus to the Indians to sail to these countries

38 Berg, C. C., *Hoofdlijnen der Javaansche Litteratur-Geschiedenis*, 1929.

39 Bosch, *Het Vragestuk Van de Hindoe-Kolonisatie van den Archipel*, 1946.

40 Quoted by Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

41 Coedes, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-21; In : *'The Making of South East Asia*, 1967, Pt. II, Coedes has elaborated and corrected his view.

42 *Suvarṇadvīpa*, pt. I, 1937, p. 37.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

The uncivilized races come in close contact with Indian merchants from whom they learnt the first lessons of culture. H. G. Quaritch Wales is right when he says, 'The first foreign voyages to disturb these early races who inhabited in these regions were parties of Indian traders who probably reached Pegu and the westcoast of Peninsula as early as the beginning of the Buddhist era'.[43] Chronologically Wales is a bit enthusiastic but otherwise his observations are quite tenable and supported by facts.

The contact between the Mediterranean and India that was established by the invasion of Alexander was further consolidated by the founding of the empire of Aśoka and later that of Kaniṣka in India and the birth in the west of the Seleucid Empire and the Roman Empire. This caused an increase in the luxury trade that was deplored by the Latin moralists of the first century.[44] Gold, spices, aromatic woods and fragrant resins were among the products of the countries and islands beyond the Ganges. The names *Takkola* (market of cardamom), *Karpūradvīpa* (the island of camphor), *Nārikeladvīpa* (the island of coconut palms), and similar other Sanskrit place names show that attracted Indians to these regions. But in the two centuries preceding the Christ, India lost its principal source of gold. Previously India obtained gold from Siberia through Bactria, but the great movements of the peoples of Central Asia in the two centuries before the Christian era[45] cut this route and deprived India of the gold it needed. As a result, India started importing a great number of gold coins from the Roman Empire in the first century A.D.[46] But the grave effects of this gold drain upon the imperial Roman economy led Emperor Vespasian (A D. 69-79) to stop this flow of gold. And it is possible that the search for an alternative source of gold may have been one of the reasons for the intensification of the relations with the " Golden Chersonese ".

At this time when the Western trade was on the decline, a stimulus to commercial expansion was provided at the beginning of the Christian era by the extension of the Chinese market after China's conquest of the countries south of the Yangtze.[47] Moreover, the Indo-Chinese trade was carried out through South East Asia and in a period when India has almost no source of gold it was but natural that the merchants directed their attention towards the South East Asian countries.

These distant voyages abroad were supported by the development in the

---

43 *Siamese State Ceremonies*, 1931, p. 12.

44 Warmington, Eric., *The Commerce Between the Roman Empire and India*, 1928; Rawlinson, H. G., *Intercourse Between India and the Western World*, 1916.

45 Poussin, La Valle'e., *L'Inde aux temps des Mauryas.*

46 Sewell, R. S., " Roman coins found in India ", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1904, pp. 591-638.

47 Krom, N. J., *Hindoe-Javaanesche Geschiedenis*, 1931.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

technique of ship building. The period witnessed the development of Indian and Chinese navies[48] and the construction of ships that were capable of transporting 600 to 700 passengers. These seaworthy junks were constructed by a technique in use in the Persian Gulf.[49] Dr. R. C. Majumdar thinks that these ship-builders might have been even Indians.[50] Another factor which helped the mariners in this period was the discovery of the periodic alternation of the monsoons by the Greek pilot, Hippalos (around the middle of the 1st century A.D.), which the Muslims knew but had kept secret. This discovery led to an unprecedented increase in maritime commerce between India and the ports of the Red Sea, the door of the west. "We must come down fourteen centuries later", writes Sylvain Levi, "to encounter an economic resolution comparable to this one, when the Portuguese revolutionized the commercial routes of all Asia.[51] And, this was bound to affect the communications by sea between India and the lands and islands of the East.

Coedes thus concludes that the eastward expansion in the early centuries of the Christian Era was mainly due to commercial enterprises.[52] To support his contention he quotes Sylvain Lévi, "A great number of Jātaka tales have dealt with maritime adventures; the sea and seafaring clearly occupied an important place in the life of India at the time when these tales were conceived".[52] This theory, like those previously mentioned, suffers from a number of defects. The basic assumption of this theory is that the initiative was in the hands of the Indian merchants. This is scornfully rejected by van Leur : "To what extent Indonesian shipping played an active role is a question never raised" ![53] In fact it were the Sumatran Malays who developed the all-sea trade route to China, and the evidences suggest that Malay seamen and ships played as important a part as the Indians in the trade of South East Asia with India and Ceylon.[54] The same

---

48 On the first relations between India and China by sea, see Pelliot Paul, "L'origine du nomde'Chine"; *Toung Pao*, XIII, 1912, pp. 457-61, and Nilakanta Sastri, K. A., "The Beginnings of Intercourse between India and China", *Indian Historical Quarterly*, XIV, pp. 380-87. Sastri's conclusions are perhaps debatable, but he gives references. Also *Cf.* Gungwu, Wang, "The Nanhai Trade : A Study of the Early History of Chinese Trade in the South China Sea", *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, XXXI, 2, 1958.

49 Pelliot Paul, "Textes Chinois concernant l'Indochine hindouisee, *Etudes Asiatiques*, II, p. 261.

50 "As a matter of fact, the known facts would certainly favour the presumption that the knowledge of the maritime developments referred to above should also be credited to the Indians although we have no evidence from Indian sources". Majumdar, R. C., *Ancient Indian Colonisation in South East Asia*, p. 17.

51 *L'Inde Civilisatrice : Aperçu historique*, 1939, p. 156.

52 *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*, p. 21.

53 Quoted by Coedes, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

54 Van Leur, J. C., *Indonesian Trade and Society*, 1955, p. 92.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

is the case with the dissemination of Indian culture.[55] Van Leur rejecting the view that traders were responsible for the diffusion of Indian culture held that most traders belonged to the lower social group while the crews were often composed of African slaves and such people could not have been "administrators of ritual, magical consecration and disseminators of rationalistic, bureaucratic written scholarship and wisdom".[56] Bosch too in his address before the University of Leiden in March, 1946, entitled "*The Problem of the Hindu Colonization of Indonesia*" rejected the theory of the transmission of Indian culture through the merchants.[57] He raised too pertinent points against this theory : (1) If merchants were responsible for the dissemination of Indian culture then the early centres of civilisation should have been found at the costal emporia, but they are found at the royal residences in the interior, and, in the case of Java, in 'the almost inaccessible plains' of Kedu and Prambanan. (2) The transmission of higher civilisation of one people to another is not possible through commercial contacts. For example, the Chinese in Indonesia have had no influence upon the local culture.[58] All this does not mean that commercial contact between India and the South East Asian countries was useless from the point of view of cultural transmission. It was this maritime contact which paved the way for that process. But to say that they were mainly responsible is to pat the wrong horse.

This brings us to another theory: The Kṣatriya hypothesis Professor C. C. Berg, the propounder of this theory, saw Indian culture introduced as a result of the activities of the Indian warrior immigrants, who played the part of the robber barons described in the Javanese Panji cycle of narratives, marrying native women and breeding a Kraton society of mixed blood.[59] This idea was, however, taken a stage further by Moens to tried to link the accession of new Indonesian dynasties with the fall of dynasties in India followed by the (hypothetical) emigration of their scions to the Archipolago.[60] B. N. Luhiya[61] and R. C. Majumdar also acquiesce to this view and the latter has quoted a number of legends in his favour. The first is about the foundation of Ligor, or Nakon Śrī Dharmarāja in the south of Thailand (Siam) ascribed to a descendant of Aśoka who fled from Magadha and embarked a vessal at Dantapura which was wrecked on the coast of Malay Peninsula.[62] The second is a Burmese tradition[63]

---

55 *Ibid.*, pp. 98-99.
56 Van Leur, J. C., *op. cit.*, p. 99.
57 *Selected Studies in Indonesian Archaeology*, 1961, p. 5.
58 Bosch, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-10.
59 Quoted by Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 19.
60 Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 19.
61 *Evolution of Indian Culture*, 1970, p. 267.
62 Majumdar, R. C., *op. cit.*, p. 13.
63 *Ibid.*, p. 15.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

according to which a Śākya chief of Kapilavastu came with an army to the country of the middle Irawady, long before the Buddha was born. This dynasty founded the Indianised state of Burma. They were overthrown by the Thai race coming from China[64] and were in turn replaced by a Kṣatriya chief.[65] Such traditions speak themselves about their veracity and hence a theory based on such a weak foundation can only be pitied. Moreover Bosch's criticism of this theory almost makes it an untenable hypothesis. The points he has raised in this connection are as follows : (1) the success of a conquering prince would have been inscribed either by the prince himself or by his descendants, (2) the words of Indian origin in the Indonesian languages show the pure Sanskrit form indicating thereby their transmission from a literary, learned court circle, whereas the settlers should have used either a Dravidian dialect or a vernacular of Āryan origin.[66]

This leaves us with the last theory, namely the " *Brāhmaṇa* hypothesis ". Van Leur, the propounder of this theory, thought that the *Brāhmaṇas* were responsible for the transmission of Indian culture in South East Asia.[67] He conceded that the contacts were made through trade but at the same time he argued that the contacts were made at the court level. According to him, the Brāhmaṇisation of South India was going on at the beginning of the Christian era and this region of India was the most important trading centre for Indonesia. Thus the princes of Indonesia, who were aware of what was happening, copied those of Dravidian India by inviting the *Brāhmaṇa* priesthood to their court[68] These *Brāhmaṇas* were responsible for the transmission of Indian culture in South East Asia which took place at the court level.[69] Bosch too, while rejecting the Vaiśya hypothesis and the Kṣatriya hypothesis, seems to favour the theory of van Leur.[70] We have, moreover, proof of this, for in Funan, the first kingdom about which the Chinese give us precise information, some officials were Indians, as is shown by the fact that their family name was the ethnic term chu[71] by which the Chinese designated the people of India There is, however, nothing to show that all of them belonged to the highest social class.[72] The observance of certain

---

64 Gogoi Padmeswar, *The Tai and the Tai Kingdoms*, 1968, p. 104.

65 *Ibid.*

66 Bosch, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

67 Leur Van, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

68 In India priests were invited by the princes to inhospitable tracts to strengthen their power against hostile populations. Sharma, R. S., *Social Changes in Early Medieval India*, 1969, p. 5. A similarity in the case of South East Asian countries is not impossible.

69 Leur Van, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

70 Bosch, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-10.

71 Abbreviation of T'ien-chu, i.e. India. *Cf. Pelliot Paul*, " Le Founan, *Bulletin de l'Ecole Francaise d'Extreme-Orient*, III, p. 252, fn. 4.

72 Coedes, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Indian ceremonies at the court, however, indicates a strong Brāhmaṇical influence in the court. The elevation of native chiefs to the level of Kṣatriya by means of *Vrātyastoma*. The Brāhmaṇic rite for admitting foreigners into orthodox community,[73] seems to have been the rule and epigraphy furnishes examples.

Coedes while discussing the nature of the cultural elements transmitted from India to South East Asia enumerates four points : (a) a conception of royalty characterised by Hindu or Buddhist cults, (b) literary expression by means of the Sanskrit language, (c) a mythology adopted from *Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata, Purāṇas* and other sanskrit texts, and (d) the observance of the *Dharmaśāstras*.[74] This will clearly indicate that the transmission had something to do with the court, not people. Hall thinks that the ambitious Kings took the help of the *Brāhmaṇas* to get them consecrated as a god-king, for, when forcing other rulers into a state of vassalage it was essential to have consecration of this sort whereby the worship was established of a *linga* as the King's sacred personality and he himself was identified with Śiva.[75] But this theory also suffers from obvious lacunae for it completely ignores the raison d'etre behind the founding of such kingdoms as that of Funan. This theory about the commercialisation of Brāhmaṇisation also does not take into account the reasons which led these *Brāhmaṇas* to migrate. The mere invitation of a foreign prince was not enough for the orthodox *Brāhmaṇas* to leave the country especially in the light of *śāstric* injuction against sea voyages.

Another theory atrributes the same credit to Buddhism as has been attributed to Brāhmaṇism by van Leur and others. Coedes even seems to suggest that Buddhism blazed the trail and appeared in South East Asia before Brāhmaṇism.[76] The number of images of Buddha found at different archaeological sites are of Amaravati school which suggest Indian influence. Moreover, some of the Buddha images are the earliest antiquities associated with India.[77] Bosch says that the Buddhists, who were unlike *Brāhmaṇas* missionaries, appeared at Indonesian courts, preached the law, converted the ruler and his family and founded an order of monks. He further adds that this stream of devotees from India stimulated a much stronger counter-current towards India of native *bhikṣus* bound for the famous monasteries of the land of the Buddha.[78] We have evidence to suggest that students from South East Asian countries visited the University of Nalanda. Indonesian pilgrims were so numerous that Balaputra-

---

73 Lévi, Sylvain, *Le Nepal*, 1905-08, I, p. 220.
74 Coedes, *op. cit.*, pp. 21ff.
75 Hall, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19.
76 Coedes, *op. cit.*, p. 21.
77 *Ibid.*, p. 18.
78 Bosch, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-12.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

deva, a Śrīvijayan King, the son of a Javanese Śailendra ruler, according to an inscription of Nalanda dated A. D. 860,[79] founded a separate monastery for them, to which king Devapāla assigned the revenues of a number of villages.[80] It has been suggested by Bosch that these students brought back with them the Indian culture and disseminated them.[81] But this process would have hardly resulted in the expansion of Indian culture in those countries. The process was, in fact, too small and can hardly explain the massive developments which took place in South East Asia.

Thus, it is amply clear that none of the theories propounded to explain the Indian expansion in South East Asia can bear the test of scrutiny. Majority of them are sadly out at tune with the event itself while some of the remaining theories are only partially true. This is, in our opinion, mainly due to the fact that different theorists have completely ignored the contemporary socio-economic condition of India. We think that the Indian expansion in South East Asia was a direct outcome of the material condition that existed in India.

From various evidences one thing that comes to our notice is the fact that the extensive colonisation of South East Asia took place in the 4th-5th centuries A.D. This was followed by migrations under the Palas (c. A.D. 750-900) as as well as the Pallavas (c. A.D. 550-750). The migration however, started in the 2nd century A.D. itself but that was not very consequential.[82] With this perspective in view we can search for the causes of these migrations in the contemporary socio-economic condition. The coming of the Guptas to power in the beginning of the 4th century A.D. marked a revival of Brāhmaṇism. Buddhism, which had dominated the scene, in the preceding centuries mainly due to the patronage of Kings like Aśoka and Kaniṣka, almost lost ground. This might have forced the Buddhist monks to go elsewhere to spread their ideas and beliefs South East Asia, which already had trading contacts with India, was probably the natural place for their visitation. This would have been facilitated by the fact that the vaiśyas as a caste, who controlled the trade, were the earliest supporters of Buddhism.

Another important development of this period was languishing trade.[83] This resulted in the decline of urban centres in the Indo-Gangetic area.[84] The period also witnessed the rise of local units of production[85] and this meant the

79 de Casparis, J. G., *Prasasti Indonesia*, II, 1956, pp. 260, 297.

80 Coedes, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

81 Bosch, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

82 Quaritch Wales, H. G., *The Making of Greater India*, 1961, pp. 29-30.

83 Sharma, R. S., *Light on Early Indian Society and Economy*, 1966, p. 88.

84 Sharma, R. S., "Decay of Gangetic Towns in Gupta and post-Gupta times," *Journal of Indian History : Golden Jubilee Volume*, 1973, pp. 135-50.

85 Sharma, R. S., *op. cit.*, p. 85.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

self-sufficiency of villages. So, in a sense the towns and villages must have lost contact. As such there was no justification of the existence of business communities in towns, rather their existence must have become an anachronism. At this time, however, the coastal people of South India were carrying on trade with the countries of South East Asia. These north Indian merchants might have seen the opportunity and probably migrated to South East Asia.

It was in this period, i.e. the Gupta and the post-Gupta times, that Brāhmaṇism advanced in Bengal and South India.[86] This process of Brāhmaṇisation might have given an impetus to make attempts to spread this religion in foreign lands like Buddhism. The state patronage was readily forthcoming from the Guptas in the North India and the Pallavas in the South India.

Another very important development of the Gupta period in Bengal was the fragmentation of land. The Kalaikuri copper-plate inscription of the Gupta year 121 (= A.D. 400-01) mentions that even 9 *Kulyavāpa*s of land had to be purchased from 5 villages.[87] This indicates that the pressure on land was great and this must have increased in the succeeding decades. As a result people from Bengal migrated to the South East Asian countries. Significantly the short-lived use of pre-*Nāgarī* script in some of the inscriptions of this area attests to a wave of Bengali influence from the end of the 7th century to the beginning of the 9th century A.D.[88]

Thus, the contemporary socio-economic conditions of India were primarily responsible for the expansion of Indian culture in South East Asia. The *śāstric* injunctions against sea voyages were ignored and even the *Brāhmaṇa*s crossed the sea, in a majority of the cases; never to return again.

86 Sharma, R. S., *Social Changes in Early Mediaeval India*, p. 12.

87 Sen, B. C., *Some Historical Aspects of the Inscriptions of Bengal*, p. XII.

88 Coedes, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

A NOTE ON THE INDORE PLATE OF BHULUṆḌA

By

V. V. MIRASHI, Nagpur.

In the *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 2, pp. 38-41 with a plate, H. G. Shastri and P. C. Parikh have edited the recently discovered plate of Bhuluṇḍa. He bears the title of *Mahārāja*, but was not independent; for he describes himself as 'meditating on the feet of a *Paramabhaṭṭāraka* (Emperor)'. The object of the inscription is to record the grant, by the king, of a village the name of which the Editors read as *Kṛṣṭāvasannaka*. It was situated in the *rāṣṭra* (division) of Dāsilakapallī on the other bank of the Narmadā (*Narmadāyāḥ para-kūle*). Two of its boundaries have also been mentioned. It lay to the east of Īśvarasenānaka and to the north of Kharjūrikā. The donees were some Brāhmaṇas whose names need not be given here. The plate mentions two dates at the end which the Editors have read as (1) the *varṣa* (year) 38, the 13th *tithi* of the bright fortnight of Vaiśākha, and (2) the *varṣa* (year) 47, the third *tithi* of the dark fortnight of Māgha. In both cases it is stated the order about the grant was given orally (*sva-mukhaṁ*) or (*sva-mukha-sandeśād-eva*). There is a reference to a *Brāhmaṇaparṣad* (an assembly of the Brāhmaṇas), but the Editors have not been able to interpret it. The plate was issued from Valkha.

This is the fourth plate issued by a royal family which, in the absence of a definite name, we may call 'the Mahārājas of Valkha'; for three of its four plates were issued from Valkha, and in the fourth the part of the plate where it is usually mentioned is broken away and lost. Of the three other plates, two were found at Indore like the present plate, and the third at Śirpur in the Dhuliā (former West Khāndesh) District.[1] They are of the kings mentioned below—

(1) *Mahārāja* Svāmidāsa—Year 67
(2) *Mahārāja* Bhuluṇḍa—Year 107
and (3) *Mahārāja* Rudradāsa—Year 117

According to the Editors, the present plate issued by *Mahārāja* Bhuluṇḍa bears two dates 38 and 47. They, therefore, think that he must be differentiated from his namesake who issued the plate of the year 107. They call the latter Bhuluṇḍa II, and the grantor of the present plate Bhuluṇḍa I. The capital of all these kings was Valkha. It has not been definitely identified. We took it to be Vāghlī in East Khāndesh. Others take it to be the village Bāgh, well known

1 See *CII*, IV, 5ff.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

for its paintings. As its boundary villages are not mentioned anywhere, its identification is uncertain.[2]

The Editors' reaading of the second date in the present plate does not seem to be correct. It is denoted by two symbols, the second of which is certainly 7, but the first may denote 70. This is how Dr. G. S. Gai had interpreted it in his address as Chairman of the Epigraphy Section of the Calcutta Session of the Indian History Congress in 1974. It must be admitted that the symbol for 40 is not very different. Bühler says that the symbol for 40 resembles the *akṣara pta*, and that for 70 resembles the *akṣara pū*.[3] As these are not very dissimilar, it is often difficult to decide which is the number intended But there is one clue to its solution which is stated below.

The present plate is written very carelessly and so the Editors have admitted in some places that they could not understand the intended meaning. In line 9, after stating the first date, viz., *svamukhaṁ varṣe* 30 8 *vaiśākha śu* 10 3, the Editors have read *Brāhmaṇa-parṣad-acaijvāpyād-anucaṇditaṁ tāmrapaṭṭe ca sanniveśitaṁ*. This makes no sense and the Editors also have admitted that the phrases are not satisfactorily legible. We suggest the reading of the portion following the date as follows—*Brāhmaṇaparṣadā vijñāpyād-anu varṇṇitaṁ tāmrapaṭṭe ca sanniveśitaṁ*. This appareently means that this was described (i.e. stated in detail) after the request made by the assembly of the Brāhmaṇas and was then recorded on the copper-plate. What seems to have happened is this :—The grant of the village was made previously in the year 38 orally. (by some previous king). It was not executed and no *tāmrapaṭṭa* (copper plate recording it) was issued. Later, in the time of Bhuluṇḍa, the Brāhmaṇa Assembly invited the attention of the *Mahārāja* to the unexecuted grant and gave details of it (as previously the order about it was given orally). Then it was engraved on the copper plate, as orally ordered by Bhuluṇḍa. If the reading of the text and its interpretation given above are correct, it would follow that there must have been a fairly long interval between the two dates, viz., (1) the first date when the grant was made and (2) the second, when, on a representation made by the State Assembly (*Parṣad*) of the Brāhmaṇas, the grant was renewed by Bhuluṇḍa and his order was engraved on a copper plate. If the Editors' reading of the second date (viz. 47) is accepted, there would be an interval of only 9 years (from the year 38 to the year 47). It is not likely that Bhuluṇḍa forgot all about his own grant made

---

2 We do not now think that Vāghlī in the Jalgaon or East Khandesh District is likely to be ancient Valkha. There is no indication of the Ābhira era being current in Khāndesh. Otherwise, the Thāḷner plates of Bhānusheṇa of the Kumbhakarṇa family (*EI.* XXXVIII. pp. 69ff.), which belong to the pre-Chālukyan period, would have been dated in it. Valkha would have to be searched in the Nemāḍ District of M.P. between the Tāpī and the Narmadā.

3 See Bühler's *Indian Palaeography*, p. 81 and Table IX (of its German ed.), columns IX and XI.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

(of course orally) only nine years before. So the correct reading of the second date in the plate appears to be the year 77.

The Editors, who read the second date as 47, took this Bhuluṇḍa as different from his namesake who made the grant of the year 107; for the same person is not likely to have made one grant in the 38th year and another in the 107th year. But if the reading given above of the portion following the second date (which the Editors could not read and understand) is accepted, it would show that there was only one Bhuluṇḍa. He was ruling in the year 77 (mentioned in the present plate) and in the year 107 mentioned in the already published grant of his.[4] An interval of 30 years is not too much to be impossible in the grants of the same king. The earliest grant dated in the year 38 was, of course, not made by Bhuluṇḍa but by some unknown predecessor of his. He only confirmed it and issued a copper plate recording it, when at a later date his attention was drawn to it.

There are some other particulars of the present grant which also require to be discussed. The Editors have taken *kṛṣṭāvasannakaṁ* in line 5 as the name of the donated village. If this reading is correct, it would indeed be a queer name. The name of the donated village given by the preceding expression which the Editors say 'is not satisfactorily legible' is *Grāhyavāhiketi vijñāyamānakaṁ*, which means that the village is known by the name *Grāhyavāhika*. *Kṛṣṭāvasannakaṁ* is difficult to intepret. Perhaps, it means '(that portion of the village) which is left untilled'.[5] The lands in the village which have already been granted to or belong to farmers are to be excluded from the donated village. The farmers are not to be ousted by the donees.

Where was this dynasty ruling? Two of its plates, viz. that of Svāmidāsa, dated in the year 67, and the other of Bhuluṇḍa, dated in the year 107, were in the possession of Pandit Vāmanaśāstrī Islampurkar of Indore, who collected antiquities from different parts of the country. Their exact findspots are not known. The third plate of Rudradāsa, dated in the year 117, was obtained from one Motiram Patil of Śirpur in the Dhuliā District. The present plate of Bhuluṇḍa, dated in the year 77, though named after Indore, is said to have been recovered from a person of Bāgh.[6] These kings were probably ruling over the region round Bāgh, but their country included some territory south of the Narmadā also. This is indicated by an expression used in the present plate. The village granted lay in the *rāṣṭra* (territorial division) of Dāsilakapallī. The latter finds mention as a *pathaka* (or a smaller subdivision of *rāṣṭra*) in the

4 *CII.* IV. pp. 8ff.

5 Perhaps *kṛṣṭāvasannaṁ* is a mistake for *kṛṣṭāvaśiṣṭaṁ*. Gai thought that the grant was of some land in the village. See his address referred to above.

6 *JOI.* XXVIII, 2, pp. 38ff.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Bāgh plate of Subandhu.[7] This locality is now known as the village Deswāliā, which lies about 14 miles almost due south of the Bāgh Caves. This identification which is almost certain leaves no doubt that these Mahārājas of Valkha were ruling over some part of Central India, north of the Narmadā. But their capital Valkha lay south of that river as is shown by an expression in the present grant. The village Grāhyavāhika granted by the present plate is described as laying on the other bank of the Narmadā (*Normadāyāḥ parakūle Dāsilakapallirāṣṭre*). This clearly implies that the drafter of the grant (in the capital of Valkha from which it was issued) was writing it at a place south of the Narmadā. The kingdom of these Mahārājas of Valkha, therefore, comprised some territory both on the north and the south of the Narmadā. It was known as Anūpa (corresponding partly to the modern Nemāḍ District of Madhya Pradesh).

From the four grants of the family known so far, we get the following years 38, 67, 77, 107 and 117. To what era do these refer ? R. C. Majumdar, who edited the grants of the years 67 and 107 many years ago,[8] referred those years to the Gupta era. When we edited the grants of Svāmidāsa, Bhuluṇḍa (year 107) and Rudradāsa in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. IV, pp. 5 ff., we referred their dates to the Ābhīra era; which, we showed, commenced in A.D. 250. Dr. G. S. Gai, in his aforementioned address at the Calcutta Session of the Indian History Congress, referred them to the Gupta era. The Editors of the present plate have accepted our view and take the two dates, which they read as 38 and 47, as recorded in the Ābhīra era. There is thus a diversity of opinion on this point. Fortunately, the present plate provides a solution of this problem.

There is no dispute about the reading 38 of the first date mentioned in the present plate. If this year is referred to the Gupta era, it would correspond to A.D. 357-58. Did Gupta rule extend to Bāgh or even to Indore, which lies north of it, by this year ? This year falls in the reign of Samudragupta. R. C. Majumdar has thus described the extent of Samudragupta's kingdom at the end of his reign (about twenty years after the proposed date of the present grant).[9] "It comprised the whole of Northern India, with the exclusion of Kāshmir, Western Punjab, Western Rājputāna, Sindh and Gujarat, and included the highlands of Chhattisgaḍh and Orissā with a long stretch of territory along the eastern coast extending as far south as Chingleput, and probably even further." Among the countries of North India excluded from the kingdom of Samudragupta, we must mention also Ākaravantī (Eastern and Western Mālwā) and Anūpa. The former was under the rule of the Western Kṣatrapas.[10] Though they may have nomi-

7 *CII*, IV, 19ff.

8 *EI*, XV, pp. 286ff.

9 *HCIP*, III, p. 12.

10 See the mention of Ākarāvantī among the countries under the rule of Rudradāman in the Junagaḍha rock inscription, *EI*, VIII, pp. 36ff.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

nally acknowledged Gupta supremacy, they were independent in all other respects. Their coins bearing dates A.D. 388 (or A.D. 388+x) have been found. Samudragupta's own inscription has been found at Eraṇ in the Saugar District of Madhya Pradesh,[11] and not westward of it. His son and successor Rāmagupta's stone inscriptions have recently come to notice near Vidiśā.[12] So the country of Daśārṇa was no doubt included in the Gupta Empire in that period. But Gupta rule did not extend then to Mālwā. Chandragupta II had therefore to embark on a *digvijaya* soon after his accession as stated in an inscription of his minister at Vidiśā.[13] It was only in *circa* A.D. 395 after the extermination of the Western Kṣhatrapas that Chandragupta II could occupy Ākaravantī (Malwa).

If Ujjain had not come under Gupta rule till A.D. 395, it goes without saying that Gupta supremacy did not penetrate to Indore, which lies about 40 miles south of it, much less to Bāgh about 80 miles still further south-west of it. So the year 38 of the present plate could not have been of the Gupta era. Otherwise, we shall have to suppose that the Gupta era was in use there in A.D. 38 + 319 =) 357, long before the commencement of Chandragupta's reign. An era spreads with the spread of the political power of the king who uses it. The Gupta era could not have preceded Gupta power in penetrating into the Anūpa country. The years in the plates of the Mahārājas of Valkha cannot, therefore, be of the Gupta era. They must therefore be of the Ābhīra era, the only other possible era which could have been prevalent there.

The Ābhīras, who rose to power about the middle of the third century A.D., had a vast empire comprising Western Mahārāṣṭra, Koṅkaṇ, South as well as part of North Gujarāt, and Anūpa, judging by the spread of their era in these countries. They seem to have appointed these Mahārājas of Valkha to rule over the Anūpa country after they conquered it. The unnamed *Paramabhaṭṭāraka* (Emperor), on whose feet they were meditating i.e. whose feudatories they were, belonged to the Ābhīra dynasty. Unfortunately, the Ābhīras' own records have not yet come to light. Ten Ābhīras ruled for 167 years as stated in the Purāṇas.[14] Their era continued in use for a long time in all the countries which they had conquered. So we find the Early Kalachuris, who ruled from Māhiṣmatī (modern Maheśvara) in the Anūpa country, used the Ābhīra era in their records.

It is noteworthy that the word used to denote the years of the two dates in the present plate is *varṣa*. So it is in all other plates of this dynasty. This word was characteristic of the *Śaka* era. It is found used *invariably* to denote

---

11 *CII.* III (first ed.), pp. 18ff.

12 *EI.* XXXVIII, pp. 46ff.

13 *CII.* III (first ed.), pp. 34ff.

14 Pargiter, *DKA.* p. 46. The Purāṇas mention their total reign-period as 67 years, but it has to be taken as 167. See *CII.* IV. p. xxvi.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

the year in the inscriptions of Western Kṣatrapas.[15] It is well known that these inscriptions are dated in the *Śaka* era started by Kaniṣka. How then is that word used in the inscriptions of these Mahārājas of Valkha ? We find that the word denoting the year in other inscriptions dated in the Ābhīra era is generally *saṁvat*. The plates of these Mahārājas of Valkha form an exception to this rule. This can be explained on the supposition that as the Western Kṣatrapas who were in occupation of the Anūpa country before, were using the word *varṣa*, the local drafters of the grants of the Mahārājas of Valkha continued to use the same word in the grants of those Mahārājas also.

15 See e.g. the dates in the inscriptions of Ṛṣabhadatta and Rudradāman.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

RE-ASSESSMENT OF THE MEANING OF "ऋणं कृत्वा घृतं पिबेत्"

By

MANJUL MAYANK, Santiniketan (West Bengal)

The well known verse :

यावज्जीवेत् सुखं जीवेत् ऋणं कृत्वा घृतं पिबेत् ।

quoted in the name of Cārvākas, in *Sarva-Darśana-Saṅgraha* of Mādhavācārya, needs re-assessment in regard to its traditionally accepted meaning. It is the common impression that the meaning of this verse is—"So long as one lives, one should live in pleasure and drink *Ghṛta* even by borrowing". Since Cārvākas have been advocating for the sensuous pleasures, this meaning may seem quite favourable to their theory. It may also imply provocation to others to use *Ghṛta* even by borrowing. The practice has always been looked down upon in the society and if figures like Cārvāka advise for borrowing in the name of Philosophy, they deserve all possible condemnation. This verse might have played a vital role in discouraging and censuring Cārvākism in India, mainly for not understanding its real import, if it be authentic at all.

The word *Samagrāhi* (collected) used by Mādhavācārya in his *Saṅgraha* is quite sufficient to show that it is not authentic. Almost, in all the authoritative texts, where references have been made to Cārvākas and their theory, this verse is missing. At present without questioning its authenticity, our effort is to make an assessment of the meaning of this verse so long understood. As a matter of fact, the word "*Ṛṇa*" in this verse seems to have misled the people for its various meanings and for not applying properly the correct one in this context. Pāṇini derives the word '*Ṛṇa*' by means of *Nipātana*,[1] restricting it in the sense of borrowing. But Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, in his *Siddhānta Kaumudī*,[2] on the authority of the *Medinī-Koṣa*, takes '*Ṛṇa*' in the sense of water also. Daivajña Sūrya, in his *Kāma-Tantra-Kāvya-Mañjarī*,[3] uses the word '*Ṛṇa*' as synonymous to water. *Śītalena Ṛṇena* in the verse may not mean with cold borrowing, instead, it means 'with cold water'. If the word '*Ṛṇa*' may convey the meaning of water in a text of *Kāma-Tantra*, it is more rational to take it in the same sense in Cārvāka system also, which mainly deals with *Artha* and *Kāma*. Moreover, "*Varamadya Kapotaḥ Śvo Mayūrāt*" is one of the famous sayings of Cārvākas which indirectly deplores the idea of borrowing. Thus the word '*Ṛṇa*' does not suit in the context of borrowing. Now *Ghṛta* has to be assessed as an item of *Ṛṇādāna* with all those circumstances under which it had to be borrowed.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

From various *Smṛtis*, we come to know that like other goods, *Ghṛta* was also an article of borrowing. Out of these *Smṛtis*, Kātyāyana alone mentions clearly the word *Sarpiṣāṃ* meaning *Ghṛta*, along with *Tailānāṃ* and *Madyānāṃ* with the rate of interest. The interest was levied eight times more on the quantity of *Ghṛta* borrowed.[4] Unfortunately, the *Smṛtis* keep silence on the occasions and circumstances under which one had to borrow *Ghṛta*. On presumption, these occasions and circumstances might have either been feeding of *Brāhmaṇas* or performance of various costly rituals in pursuit of heavenly bliss. Evidences also show that the practice of drinking *Ghṛta* might have existed in the past. Urvaśī of the *Ṛgveda*,[5] is one of those who barely lived upon *Ghṛta*. The phrase " *Sarpiḥ Piba*[6] " used in day to day blessing in past and declaration of the *Nāradīya Śikṣā*[7] to drink *Ghṛta* before starting a vedic recitation, are the other clues also.

Thus, if one drags *Ṛṇādāna* and *Ghṛtapāna* simultaneously into one, which are altogether two different aspects, only then, the traditionally accepted meaning of this verse can be justified, But, this justification may cost more to the protagonists of Indian culture and prosperity in the past. Prosperity and abundance may neither presuppose equal distribution nor availability of consumers goods for all. Borrowing *Ghṛta* at an exorbitant rate of interest, might have been beyond the reach of common man.

Therefore, the meaning of the word '*Ṛṇa*' in the verse should be accepted as synonymus to water and not to borrowing, meaning thereby—

घृतम् ऋणम् इति कृत्वा अर्थात् जलं मत्वा पिबेत् । इन्द्रियसुखार्थं शरीरपुष्ट्यर्थं घृतस्य व्यवहारो जलवत् विधेयः ,

that is, *Ghṛta* has to be used as a substitute of water, suggesting, not to spoil a precious thing like *Ghṛta* by burning it into fire.

References

१ ऋणमाधमर्ण्ये । पाणिनि अष्टाध्यायी, अ. ८ । २ । ६०

२ प्रवत्सतरकम्बलवसनदशार्णानामृणे । वार्तिक सं. ३६०८९
नदी च दशार्णा । ऋणशब्दो दुर्गभूमौ जले च । सिद्धान्त कौमुदी, अव्ययीभाव प्रकरणम् ।

३ प्रबुद्धस्तु ततः सोऽपि शरीरेण प्रपीडितः ।
सर्वमग्निं शान्तयित्वा शीतलेन ऋणेन च ॥
कामतन्त्र काव्यमञ्जरी । श्लोक २१

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

४ तैलानाञ्च सर्वेषां मद्यानामथ सर्पिषाम् ।
वृद्धिरष्टगुणा प्रोक्ता गुडस्य लवणस्य च ॥
काश्यायनस्मृतिः । विवादरत्नाकरः पृ. १६

५ घृतस्य स्तोकं सकृदह आहनाम ।
ऋग्वेद १० । ५५ । १६

६ चतुर्भागी—डॉ. मोतीचन्द्र and वासुदेव शरण अग्रवाल

७ कृत्वा चावश्यकान् धर्मान् जठरं पर्युपास्य च ।
पीत्वा धूमं घृतेनैव शुचिर्भूत्वा ततो वदेत् ॥
नारदीयशिक्षा ।

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

SELECT CONTENTS OF ORIENTAL JOURNALS

By

P. H. Joshi, Baroda

Acta Orientalia, Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Akademiai Kiado, Budapest Tomas XXXIII, Fasciculus 1, 1979

Damdinsüren Ts. (Ulan Bator): Two Mongolian Colophons to the Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-Sūtra

Kara, G.: Qaradas—Translator's Note to Professor Damdinsüren's Two Mongolian Colophons

Bulletin of the Indian Institute of History of Medicine, Indian Institute of History of Medicine, Osmania Medical College Buildings, Residency, Hyderabad 500 001, A.P.

Vol. VII, Nos. 1 & 2, January & April 1977

Pandey, Ayodhya and Raghunathan, K.: Sukira Sudhira

Sharma, P. V.: Plants in the Works of the Three Sages of Sanskrit Grammar

Rama Rao, B.: Medicine and Health in the Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa of Padmapurāṇa

Shastri, V. V. S.: Medical Knowledge of Vemana

Nos. 3 and 4, July and October 1977

Pandey, Ayodhya: Gayadāsa

Rama Rao, B.: Daily Regimen in Yaśastilakacampū of Somadeva

Parabrahma Sastry, P. V.: Epigraphical Allusion to Surgery in Ayurveda

Hussain, S. A.: A List of Unani Medical Printed Books in Arabic language Preserved in Different Libraries of Hyderabad

Hussain, S. A.: Unani Medicine during Nizam Dynasty

Vol. VIII, Nos. 1-4. 1978

Rama Rao, B.: Development of Dravyaguna in India

Rama Rao, B.: Contribution of Andhra Pradesh to Ayurveda in Sanskrit

Zysk, Kenneth G.: A Note on Ancient Indian Medicine.

Glory of India, Motilal Banarasidas, Bungalow Road, Jawahar Nagar, Delhi, 110007

Vol. III, No. 1, March 1979

Singh, Sanghsen: The Methodology of Philosophical Analysis of the Mahāyāna Sūtras with Special Reference to the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra

Kirtisinghe, Buddhadasa P.: Kapilavastu and Lumbini Park

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Indian Philosophical Quarierly, Pratap Centre of Philosophy, Amalner and Department of Philosophy, University of Poona, Pune 411007

Vol. VII, No. 2, January 1980

Barlingay, S. S. : Experience and Reflection Science, Philosophy and Social Life

Gustafson, James M, : Religion and Morality

Chakravarty, Nilima : Dharma—Evolution of the Hindu Ethos

Kothari, M. M, : The war philosophy of the Bhagavadgītā—Has it any Relevance to-day ?

Jain Journal, Jain Bhawan, P 5 Kalakar Street, Calcutta-7

Vol. XIV, No. 3, January 1980

Lishk, Sajjan Singh : Certain Peculiarities of Jaina School of Astronomy

No. 4, April 1980

Ohira, Suzuko : Yoga Triplet

Roth, Gustav: The Woman and Tree Motif Salabhanjika—Dalamalika in Prakrit with Special Reference to Śilpaśāstras including Notes on Dohada and Related Jaina Texts

Journal of Indian Philosophy, D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, Holland Boston U.S.A.

Vol. 7, No. 2, June 1979

Mukherjea, A. K. : The Definition of Pervasion (vyāpti) in Navya-Nyāya II

Christie, Elizabeth : Indian Philosophers on Poetic Imagination (Pratibhā)

Miller, Barbara Stoler : On Cultivating the Immeasurable Change of Heart—The Buddhist Brahma-Vihāra Formula

No. 3, September 1979

Paul, Diana : An Introductory Note to Parmārtha's Theory of Language.

Vattanky, John : Śaśadhara's Īśvaravāda—An Important Source of Gaṅgeśa's Īśvaravāda

Chatterjee, Tara : Did Prabhākara hold the View that Knowledge is Self-Manifesting ?

Hardy, Friedhelm : The Philosopher as Poet—A Study of Vedāntadeśika's Dehalīśastuti

Journal of Tamil Studies, International Institute of Tamil Studies, Tamil Nadu No 16, December 1979

Swaminathan, A. : Self Immolation and Human Sacrifice in the History of South India

Veluppillai, A : Tamil Influence in Ancient Sri Lanka with Special Reference to Early Brahmi Inscriptions

Khairae, Vishvanath : Tamil, the Language of Prehistoric Maharashtra

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay, Asiatic Society of Bombay, Town Hall, Bombay 400023, Maharashtra

Vols. 49, 50, 51 ; 1974-75-76

Apte, K. V.: Perception is Impossible—An Exposition of Nāgārjuna's Mādhyamaka-Kārikā, ch. III

Athavale, R. B.: Śaṅkarācārya's Spiritual Interpretation of Some Ṛgvedic Ṛks

Bapat, G. V.: Hunting—A Royal Sport in Ancient India

Bhandari, U. S.: Rājasūya and Jānarājya

Bhat, M. S.: Indentity of Tautātita

Bhise, Usha R.: Sāmagāna—A Blending of Two Types of Music

Dandekar, R. N.: Some Treads in Indian Historiography

Dange, S. A.: Rain and Sex-pairing (Mithuna)

Dange, Sindhu S.: The Caitya-Yajña

Davane, G. V.: The Moon in the Vedic Literature

Kulkarni, V. M.: Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa—Prakrit Text Restored

Moghe, S. G.: Motivations of Punarvacana (Repetition)

Sharma, B. N.: Hanūmān in Indian Art

Vajpeyi, R.: Bṛhaspati on State Patronage to Freebooters

Tagare, G. V.: A Propos " Aryabhaṭa and Lokāyatas "

Tagare, G. V.: Date of Kundakunda

Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrita Vidyapeetha, Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Motilal Nehru Park, Allahabad-2

Vol. XXXIV, Part 1-2, Jan.-June 1978

Ram Gopal: Dāsa Varṇa in the Ṛgveda

Shukla, Siddha Nath: Kapiñjala Hymns of the Ṛgveda

Pandey, Lalta Prasad: Development of Horticulture in the Vedic Age

Tiwari, U. K.: A Brief Note on Bṛhaspati and Uśanas as quoted in the Epic

Tripathi, R. R.: Two Unpublished Stone Sculptures from Bharadvāja Aśrama, Allahabad

Nath, S.: An Identification of the River Ho-Nam-Mo-Chiang

Rukmini, T. S: The Theory of Knowledge in the Yoga System

Gupta, Sarita: Causation as a Relation

Shukla, Rama Kant: The Influence of Kālidāsa on Raviṣeṇa

Tripathi, G. P.: A Comparative Study of Divorce in Dharma-śāstras and the Modern Hindu Law

Arora, Raj kumar: The Concept of Sahaja in the Ādi Grantha

Anjana, Bapulal: Vivaha—Sanskṛta Rūpakoṁ ke Pariprekṣya meṁ (Hindi)

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art, Indian Society of Oriental Art, 17 Park Street, Calcutta 16

Vol. IX, 1977-78

Dr. Motichandra Commemoration Volume—Part II

Mehta, R. N. : Town Planning at Champaner

Sonavane, V. H. : Matṛkā Sculpture from Mataria and Ardhanārīśvara from Tarsang (Panchmahals)

Agrawala, Prithvi : A Note on Ardhanārī Gaṇapati

Journal of the Oriental Institute, Oriental Institute, M. S. University of Baroda, Baroda.

Vol. XXIX, Nos. 1-2, September—December 1979

Nayak, C. J. : Weapons in the Nāṭyaśāstra

Banerji, Sureshchandra : Lexicographical Notes on the Navasāhasāṅka-carita

Mirashi, V. V. : New Light on the Early History of the Huṇas in India

Shastree, K. K : Influence of Sanskrit on Gujarati Language and Literature

Kulkarni, V. M. : Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa—Prakrit Text Restored

Norman, K. R. : Middle Indo-Aryan Studies XIV-XV

Chaterjee, Asim Kumar : Was there a Pre-Gupta Vikramāditya ?

Dwivedi, Gautam N. : Advent of Śaṅkara in the Central Himalayas

Shastri H. G. and Jamindar, Rasesh : The Reconstruction of the Cronological Relation between Nahapāna and Cāṣṭana and the Origin of Śaka Era in the light of the Recently Known Early Dates of Cāṣṭana

Varadpande, M. L : Prekṣaṇaka—A Temple Drama

Mallison, F. : Saint Sudāmā of Gujarat—Should the Holy be Wealthy ?

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 56 Queen Anne Street, London WIM 9LA

No. 2, 1979

Gonda, J. : Agni in Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā 9-66 and 67

Bhattacharyya, P. K. : Two Interesting Coins of Śaśāṅka

(The) Mysore Orientalist, Oriental Research Institute, Mysore

Vol. XII, 1979

Shastri, P. S. : A New Dimension of the Naiṣadhīyacarita

Shivaramaiah, B. K. : Madhyamakāvya

Hegde, R. D. : The Problem of Memory in Indian Philosophy

Murthy, S. R. N. : Earth Science Studies in Sanskrit

Nagar, M. L. : Vikramāṅkadevacarita and Alaṅkāraratnākara

Nagaraja Rao, H. V. : Samāsaśaṅkhaḥ (ed.)

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Svādhyāya, Oriental Institute, M. S. University of Baroda, Baroda

Vol. 16, No. 4, V.S. 2035 Aug. 1979 (Janmāṣṭamī)

Kantawala, S. G. : Vaidika Samskṛta ane Praśiṣṭa Samskṛta—Eka Tulanātmaka Vihaṅgāvalokana (Gujarati)

Pendse, S. N. : Adhunika Saṁskṛta Sāhityamāṁ Hāsya (Gujarati)

Chandarvakar, Pushkar : Saurāṣṭranāṁ Rajavāḍāṃ-māṃ-nā Karaviṣayanā Pracalita Śabdo (Gujarati)

Rami, Anjana M. : Mattavilāsa Prahasana—Eka Dṛṣṭipāta (Gujarati)

Shastri, Hariprasad : Śīlādītya Chaṭhṭhānuṁ Āsodara Dānaśāsana Valabhi Samvat 421 (Gujarati)

Vora, Manibhai : Paścima Saurāṣṭranī Prācīna Pratimāo (Gujarati)

Teluguvaani, International Telugu Institute, Barkatpura, Hyderabad 500027 Andhra Pradesh

Vol. V, Nos, 1-4, Jan.-Apr. 1980

Krishna Murthy, K. : Games and Amusements of the Ikshvaku's of Nagarjunakonda

Vishveshveshvaranand Indological Journal, Vishveshvaranand Vishva Bandhu Institute of Sanskrit and Indological Studies, Punjab University, Hoshiarpur

Vol. XVII, Parts 1-2, 1979

Gonda, J. : Ṛgveda-saṁhitā, 5.78

Dange, S. A. : Vedic Dvibarhás—A Wonder-Working Priest

Chaube, Braj Bihari : Myth and Reality in the Ṛgveda with Special Reference to Indra-Vṛtra Myth

Shastri, Yogeshwari : Three Maharashtrian Surnames—A Study in Their Origin

Satya Vrat : Kumāradāsa's Indebtedness to Kālidāsa

Sharma, D. D. : Vasavadattā—The Most Popular and Multi-Dimensional Woman Character of Sanskrit Drama

Murti, Suryanarayana : The Impact of Advaita Philosophy on Abhinavagupta's Interpretation of the Rasa-sūtra as Reported by Jagannātha

Bhattacharya, Biswanath : Critical Observations on an Overlooked Reference to King Lalitāditya of Kāshmīra in Udbhaṭa's Bhāmahavivaraṇa

Gopalam, V. : A Critique on the Interpolations in Kālīdāsa's Meghadūta

Maan Singh : Bāṇa's Indebtedness to Subandhu

Bhardwaj, Sudhi Kant : Semantic History of the Word Jaghanya

Raghunathacharya, S. B. : A Note on the Word Pretya-Bhāva

Tiwari, Anant Sharan : Mādhava on Parā and Aprā Vidyās

Bharadvaja, O. P. : Gaṅgā to Ghaggar with Vālmīki

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Mirashi, V. V. : The Location of the Māhiṣaka Country
Dhal, U. N. : Kaliṅga in Purāṇa Literature
Bajpai, K. D. : Ancient Malvā and Its Contribution to Pictorial Art
Lokesh Chandra : Cultural Contacts of Indonesia and Srilanka in the Eighth Century and their Bearing on the Barabudar

(The) Voice of Śaṅkara, Ādi Śaṅkara Advaita Research Centre, I-E Rosewood Offices, Nungambakkam High Road, Madras, 600034

Vol. 4, Nos. 1-2, May-Aug. 1979

Mahadevan, T. M. P. : Mission of Sankara
Gangadharan, N. : An Exposition of the Uttaragītā in the Light of the Commentary of Gauḍapāda
Shivaramamurti, C. : The Influence of Śaṅkara in India and Abroad
Veezhinathan, N. : The Manifestation and the Positive Nature of Avidyā

Yogamīmāṁsā, Kaivalyadhama, Lonavala 410 403

Vol. XIX, No. 1, April 1977

Jha, P. and Sahay, G. S. : Tantra—In the Light of Yoga
Joshi, K. S. : On Patanjali's Notion of Sleep as a Vṛtti

Nos. 2 & 3, July 77 to Oct. 78

Jha, P. and Sahay, G. S. : Concept of Īśvara in Yogasūtra

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

REVIEWS

Nirukta Notes Series II--M. A. MAHENDALE, Pub. Deccan College Post-graduate and Research Institute, Pune-411 006, Pp. 80, Price Rs. 20/-, $. 7.

The present work is a collection of eleven notes on the *Nirukta* and an article on the Science of Etymology, originally written in Marathi. As in the *Nirukta Notes Series I*, here also we find that Dr. Mahendale has fully dealt with the interpretations and explanations of some knotty passages and terms occurring in the *Nirukta*. After discussing the interpretations of Indian and Western scholars, the author has given his own explanations. He explains *Anūpa, Ardhanāman, Vibhakti, Brahman, Jāmi* and *Ajāmi, Aihapadika, Sattva-nāman* and *Karmanāman, Āditya* : *Āditeya* and *Karmopasaṅgraha Nipāta*. He explains some technical terms used by Yāska in Note 8, and Yāska's second rule of derivation in Note 11.

It would seem that many of his explanations are novel and striking but it is difficult to say that all of them are wholly acceptable. In the first note one is easily reminded of the word *Dvīpa* in which *a* of *apa* gives way to the lengthening of an earlier vowel. Mahendale's explanation of *Ardhanāman* as a technical term meaning a noun which is declinable but not accented is interesting, but to postulate the existence of such a term is not warranted by any other evidence. In *Atharvaveda Prātiśākhya* IX.43 (Ed. Sūryakānt), we have a similar case—"*Kam iti Nipātaḥ. Trividham anudāttam. Avyayam. Sarvanāma. Sukhanāma ca.*" Further there is an illustration of *tva* meaning 'half'. As for *Sama* as *ardhanāma*, the author has only some ms. evidence which is not entirely reliable. The explanation of *Vibhaktiḥ* as divisions rather than cases is also not easy to accept. When Yāska lays stress on the meaning of a word in a particular context, the reference to cases is not uncalled for. The author's explanation of the passage IX. 20 containing the words *Jāmi* and *Ajāmi* is peculiar. To say that '*Atirekanāma*' explains *Jāmi* and "*Bāliśasya.....upajanaḥ*" refers to *Ajāmi* is not warranted by the text. It does not take into consideration the particle *vā* which is twice repeated and which therefore means that three meanings are given. If Mahendale wants us to believe that *a* is an *upajana* indicating some or other meaning different from negation, it is necessary that he should give similar instances. The note on *Aikapadika* (*Nirukta* I.14) is given in all the details. The author thinks that *Aikapadika* is a formation in which either the *prakṛti* or the *pratyaya* is of unique occurrence. He seems to emphasise the contrast in *Kṛto' pyaika-padikāḥ*, and has to interpret *Darvihomī* as two words. *Api* is very often used by Yāska in the sense of 'also' and there is no harm in understanding the word in that sense. *Aikapadika* in N. IV. 1, covers not only

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

homonymes but also *anavagatasaṁskārāḥ nigamāḥ*. What Yāska wants to say is that there are some words of infrequent occurrence like *vratati* and others which are formed from verbs (*kṛtaḥ*) and also (*api*) the grammatical analysis of which are not known. Their meaning is, however, clear. Mahendale's attempt to postulate *Sattvanāma* as a distinct class of nouns as against *Karmanāma* is similar to his interpretation of *Ardhanāma*. He infers *karmanāma* as a technical term on the basis of the words *Kārmanāmika-saṁskāra*, while he refuses to accept *Karmanāma* in *Nirukta* II. 13, III. 1 and V. 12 as a technical term. What Yāska says in I. 1 by *sattvanāmabhiḥ* is just this that an action which has become embodied and which has thus become a *sattva* is expressed not by verbs but by nouns, which denote *sattvas*. In note a, Mahendale deals with the problem of *Āditya-Āditeya* (N. II. 13) and suggests an alternative reading of the passage. The problem is not however completely solved, as the author himself is not sure of what Yāska meant. (see p. 49 ·.

The note on *Karmopasaṅgraha Nipāta* is important. After rejecting the interpretations of ancient and modern scholars, Mahendale suggests two explanations. My understanding of the *nipātas* of this class is just this : The *Karmo. Nipātas* convey their own meanings. That these meanings are separate is indeed understood (*aha vijñāyate*) but they are not as distinctly comprehended as would have been the case if they are expressly stated. (*na tu auddeśikam iva vigraheṇa pṛthaktvāt*). Thus *ca* stands for *samuccaya*. When we say *Rāmas' ca Kṛṣṇas' ca* we do understand *samuccaya*, but if we say *Rāma-kṛṣṇayoḥ samuccayaḥ*, the meaning of *samuccaya* is stated in words (My Gujarati Edition-*Nighaṇṭu and-Nirukta*: Surat, '72).

In the last note, Mahendale explains *vṛttisāmānya* in Yāska's second rule of derivation as commonness of behaviour of a given sound. The meaning is quite plausible. As regards note 8 and the article on the science of Etymology there is nothing very striking.

In spite of the difference of opinions detailed above, one has to admit that Dr. Mahendale has, in these and earlier notes, brought to light many knotty problems in the *Nirukta* and discussed them fully and clearly.

A. D. SHASTRI

Śṛṅgāra-Rasa-Maṇḍana of Śrī Viṭṭhaleśa ; Cri. ed. by G. V. Devasthali, Published by Hon. Secretary. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona 411 004, pp. XII × 36; Price : Not Printed.

Mr. Devasthali deserves full congratulations on his having brought out a critical edition of *Śṛṅgāra-rasa-maṇḍana* of *Śri Viṭṭhaleśa*, the son of *Śri Vallabhācārya*, the famous exponent of the *Puṣṭi-bhakti* doctrine. And all the more so,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

because, so far as I know, he does not belong to this sect. For, generally, the followers of a sect alone study, edit and publish such sectarian works. The beauty of this publication lies in the fact that the editor, though completely unbiassed, has a very high regard for the poetical powers and the devotional spirit of the author.

One word about this eroticism in devotional literature : There are two types of devotional persons. They are either moralists or aestheticists. For the former, the editor's allegorical explanation is fully justified. But as for the latter, their attitude may well be known from

(1) The following current stanza,

शृङ्गारी चेत् कविः काव्ये जातं रसमयं जगत् ।
स एव वीतरागश्चेन् नीरसं सर्वमेव हि ।।

and (2) *Śri Viṭṭhaleśa's* request elsewhere,

प्रार्थये रसिकाः स्वैरं पश्यन्त्विदमहर्निशम् ।
एतद्रसानभिज्ञस्तु मा द्राक्षीदपि वैष्णवः ।।

This attitude is, however, completely free from immorality. For otherwise, so great a moralist as *Kabīra* would not have exclaimed :

'कबीर, कबीर' तुम क्या कहो
जाओ यमुनाके तीर ।
एक गोपीके प्रेममें
बह जाय कोटि कबीर ।।

N. K. BAMBHANIA

Vyañjanā-Vimarśaḥ (A critical study of Vyañjanā) by Dr. RAVI SHANKAR NAGAR, Kirori Mal College, University of Delhi, published by Vandana Prakashan, Delhi, 1977, Price Rs. 60.00, Dy 8 VO, pp. 290 in 10 points.

Vyañjanā is the name of the suggestive potentiality of the words and non-verbal expressions and objects. Words are supposed to convey meanings by virtue of different powers. The more commonly recognized powers are Abhidhā (Denotation) Lakṣaṇā (Indication) and Vyañjanā (suggestion). The different schools of Indian Philosophy discussed the powers of word as a part of epistemological study. In the domain of poetics, these powers came to be more vigorously discussed by the theorists beginning with Ānandavardhan (c. 850 A.D.). Earlier, grammarians did not very much bother about these powers. But the grammarians like Nāgeśabhaṭṭa, who came after Ānandavardhan, began to take great interest in them.

Ānandavardhana for the first time wrote a systematic treatise to show that creative literature in any of its forms becomes most appealing when it possesses a

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

predominant suggested content. Rasa or Aesthetic Experience is also recognized by him as a variety of suggested sense. Suggested sense in any form is conveyed by Vyañjanā or the suggestive potentiality of the words. A composition having a predominant suggested sense is designated Dhvani by Ānandavardhana, who had to take great pains to convince even his contemporaries about the existence of the Vyañjanā function. He tried to derive support from the sphoṭa theory of the Grammarians for his idea of Dhvani and refuted all the probable objections from the Mīmāṁsakas and Naiyāyikas in respect of the recognition of Vyañjanā as a power of the word. Amongst the later theorists there arose a vehement controversy regarding the desirability of the recognition of Vyañjanā function and its scope and nature etc., both within and without the field of poetics, as in the *Śabdaśaktiprakāśikā* of Jagadīśa.

The promulgation of the Dhvani theory by Ānandavardhana has put the entire Indian speculation on Poetics and Aesthetics in a new key. All of Ānandavardhana's trend setting ideas revolve round the concept of Vyañjanā. Hence, any modern critical work on the Dhvani theory is bound to dwell at some length on the conception of Vyañjanā also. There were already a number of critical works on the concept of Dhvani including one by the present reviewer. But Dr. Nagar's *Vyañjanā Vimarśaḥ* is the only published book devoted exclusively to the highly debatable conception of Vyañjanā. It must be unreservedly admitted that the present work is decidedly an improvement on all the existing literature on Vyañjanā.

The work is divided into fourteen chapters. Views of a dozen theorists on the purpose of and definition of poetry are critically examined in the first chapter. It is shown that the definition offered by Mammaṭa is the most logical one. This definition makes it imperative to investigate the scope and nature of Abhidhā function in the second chapter where the views of all the schools of thought including the Buddhists and the Grammarians are fully assessed. The third chapter is devoted to a critical examination of the Lakṣaṇā function. The remaining eleven chapters are devoted to a complete and comprehensive study of the Vyañjanā function, its origin, development, scope and varieties, with an objective evaluation of all the views for and against its recognition as a separate function.

As stated in the very beginning, the suggestive potentiality may belong also to objects and non-verbal expressions. But the present study is confined only to the field of verbal expressions. Yet, it must be duly appreciated that the treatment, so far as it is concerned with the Vyañjanā function of the words, is impressively precise and free from ambiguity.

This book is written thoroughly in Sanskrit. The language is chaste, idiomatic, elegant, and free from unnecessary rhetorics and verbosity. It is quite

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

convincingly demonstrated that a critical work may be written even in Sanskrit with full conformity with the norms of modern research. The justification of the employment of Sanskrit for such a purpose is more elaborately discussed by the present Reviewer in his own Sanskrit work *Vyañjanā prapañca samīkṣā*.

A review is likely to appear to be drab and biased when it happens to be all praise with a saintly silence about the shortcomings of the work concerned. But the present work under review is really free from lapses. The only two mistakes that could be detected are "Sharma Gauri Nath" for "Shastri Gauri Nath" (p.145 n) and 1961 for 1968 (p.280) being the date of work of the present reviewer.

Technically also the book is very nicely produced the Bibliography and the Index appear to have been very carefully prepared ; the printing is very neat and bright, and the total get up could easily match the product of any Western Publisher.

MUKUNDA MADHAVA SHARMA

Madhusūdana Sarasvatī on the *Bhagavadgītā* : by S. K. GUPTA, published by Motilal Banarsidas, Varanasi, 1977, pp. 16 + 344, Price Rs. 100.

Throughout the ages, *Bhagavadgītā*, is found as an extraordinary and phenomenal treatise and hence ancient and modern scholars strive at giving meanings and interpretations of *Bhagavadgītā*, which forms one of the texts of the three *prasthānas*.

The commentary of *Madhusūdana Sarasvatī* is very scholastic, lucid and vivid. This translation, too, for the same reason, is as important as the English translation of *Śāṅkarabhāsya* of Shri Mahadev Shastri.

The editor seems to have digested the commentary and its principles thoroughly well, because his translation is very clear and intelligible to scholars and students. Thus, it is, undoubtedly, utmost important in the present days.

The book contains a biographical sketch of the commentator, introduction, the verses in *Devanāgarī* script, its translation acc. to the commentary of *Madhusūdana Sarasvatī*, alongwith the translation of the commentary. This type of arrangement draws the attention of any reader at the first sight of the book.

Beautiful binding, eye-captivating coverpage and attractive printing justify the price of the book. (Rs. 100/- only)

This book will prove most indispensable for the liabraries of the colleges and the universities.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

The learned editor deserves compliments for such an erudite publication. We await other scholarly works from his clear mind.

JANI JAYDEV A.

Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. II (Indian Metaphysics and Epistemology : The tradition of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika up to Gaṅgeśa.) ed. by Karl H. Potter ; published by Messers Motilal Banarasidas, Delhi-7, 1977 ; pages xiii + 743 price Rs. 150-00.

The volume under review is second in the series of volumes on Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies. The first volume entitled, ' Bibliography of Indian Philosophies ' was published by the same publisher in 1970.

As the editor of the present volume Mr. Karl H. Potter has clarified at the outset this volume is a resume of current knowledge about the classical Indian Philosophical systems of Nyāya,Vaiśeṣika in their earlier stages. It covers the result of the strenuous studies in both the systems of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika from their inception in their respective sūtra treatises up to Gaṅgeśa i.e. about 1350 A.D. This is done with a view to covering the literature of these two systems which preceded the rise of Navya-Nyāya—New Nyāya with Gaṅgeśa.

The present work provides first of all a very detailed and extensive introductory section for both these systems of Indian Philosophy and then starts giving the summaries of works belonging to the literature of the philosophy of both these systems. Thus the traditionally famous treatises of nearly 56 authors, including the pioneers in the field viz. Gautama and Kaṇāda are given which makes the work a voluminous one consisting of 744 pages.

While giving the summaries of the works of these doyens of the classical Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika-systems, the editor Mr. Karl H. Potter has taken great pains to fix the chronology of the authors too in order to ' assist the reader in tracing the development of the thought of these schools. ' These summaries are not from the pen of Mr. K. Potter only, but they have been solicited from scholars around the world—Indian, Japanese and American scholars. This endows the book at once with the international importance which is its special characteristic.

The first part of the book containing the introductory material about Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika deals with the following topics : (1) Historical resume (2) Theory of value, (3) Nature of a philosophical system, (4) Relations (5) Substance, (6) Qualities and Motions, (7) Universals, Individuators and Absences (8) Meaning and Truth (9) Logical Theory.

Thus the editor has here tried to cover up the above fundamental topics of both these systems of philosophy in 9 chapters only. After thoroughly discuss-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

ing all the above topics the editor takes up the works of eminent exponents of the systems of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika philosophy beginning with Kaṇada and Gautama, the authors of the Sūtra treatises of the systems. He has given an English rendering of the Vaiśeṣika sūtras, and has dropped the idea of giving such rendering of Nyāya sūtras. Instead of giving a word for word translation of the sūtras of Gautama, the editor has given a detailed analytical treatment of all the topics of the said sūtras. Then he turns to Vātsyāyana, the famous Bhāṣyakara. Then he has taken up the subsequent authors one by one. Thus Candramati or Maticandra, Bhāvivikta, Udyotakāra the author of Nyāya-vārtika, Ātreya, Prīticandra, Aviddhakarṇa, Visvarūpa, Dhairyarāśi, Jayanta Bhatta, Trilocana, Bhāsarvajña, Sanātanī, Vyomaśiva, the author of a commentary called Vyomavatī on Praśatapāda's Padārthadharmasaṁgraha, Vācaspati Miśra, Śridhara, the author of Nyāyakandali, Śrivatsa, Aniruddha, Udayana the prolific writer of many important treatises, Aparārka-deva, Śrikaṇṭha, Vallabha, Varadaraja Miśra, Śivāditya, Bhaṭṭa Vadīndra, Bhaṭṭa Rāghava, Divākara Upādhyāya, Vādi Vagīśvara, Nārāyaṇa Sarvajña, Keśava Miśra, Viśvanāthāśrama, Prabhakaropādhyaya, Abhayatilaka, Sondaḍopādhyāya, Maṇikaṇṭha Miśra, Śaśadhara, Taraṇi Miśra, Raviśarva Viṣṇumiśra, Vidhya-dhara Miśra, Śrikara and Candranana—an almost galaxy of the authors on Nyāya-vaiśeṣika is completely dealt with, giving summaries of their work, many times having a very exhaustive treatment and as far as possible fixing up their dates in order to give a correct picture of chronology of these authors too.

Although in the title of the present volume Gangeśa, the famous pioneer of Navya Nyāya figures as if marking the lower limit of the period covered up by the work, no separate summary of his work nor any details about his life are given. He has been merely alluded to by stray references on pp. 3, 8, 16, 167, 199, 521, 660, 667-9, 682, 684, 708, 712-13, 715 etc.

After discussing the contribution of all the above authors a separate section is given containing foot-notes to the chapters of the book. At the end a systematic alphabetical index is given which definitely is quite important from the point of view of its utility for the purposes of research. (pp. 716-744)

It appears from a cursory perusal of the book that it has been intended to be a good compilation of information regarding the authors and then works as far as these two systems of philosophy are concerned. But it should be noted that no where any quotation from the original Sanskrit texts is given. The editor might have avoided this to make the work more accessible to persons having common type of interest and not a specially academic one.

This will become more clear in the words of the editor himself as he writes in the preface p. xii, "It is to be stressed that the work is addressed to philosophers primarily and indologists secondarily. Of course we hope that the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

materials here presented will, within the limits of our intent, be adjudged sufficiently accurate in terms of scholarship. The editor has endeavoured to obtain the work of some of the leading scholars of the system to furnish summaries. However these summaries omit large portions, may well omit sections which others deem of primary importance, and will otherwise deviate from the evaluations likely to be made by the Sanskritists. In order that there be no misunderstanding it is well to mention these points here. These summaries, then, are not substitutes for scholarship, but guides and markers for further study on the part of trained scholars."

This makes the view and purpose of the editor very clear. As is described the editor has worked for the project of the publication of this book nearly for seventeen years, and the present work is the fruit of that love's labour.

On the whole, judging even on a cursory perusal the work appears definitely to be a well planned effort of compilation of the material and presenting it to the readers with a marked, clear perspective. The editor really deserves congratulations for it.

M. M. PATHAK

'*The Philosophy of Nimbārka*' by MADAN MOHAN AGRAWAL, published by Shrimati Usha Agrawal, Gali Manihar, Sadabad (Mathura), 1977, pp. iii + ii + ii + 150, Price Rs. 40/-.

It is a matter of great pleasure to find the book '*The Philosophy of Nimbārka*' giving comprehensive treatment to Nimbārka's Philosophy. The book is in two parts—Part I dealing with Dvaitādvaita Philosophy and Part II dealing with Relation of Jīva and Brahman. The author has remarkably succeeded in explaining the concept of Svābhāvika-Bhedābhedavāda of Nimbārkācārya. The contradiction in the term Svābhāvika-Bhedābheda which appears at first sight disappears after going through the explanation offered by Shri Nimbārkācārya. This Svābhāvika-Bhedābhedavāda is explained by the illustration of gold and ornaments of gold, (P. 20 and P. 31 and P. 72) and by the illustration of foams, waves and the rest and the sea (P. 20), by that of the tree and its leaves, fruits, branches etc. (P. 20 and 34) and by that of clay-jar and lump of clay (P. 36), as well as by that of the serpent and its coil (P. 37). The Svābhāvika bhedābhedavāda of Nimbārka which is his special contribution as regards the relation of Jīva, Jagat and Brahman seems to be very reasonable as its acceptance enables him to interpret all the Śruti passages easily without being himself compelled to treat some passages as subordinate unlike the followers of Dvaitavāda or Advaitavāda (P. 37).

Nimbārka's concept of Jīva is as follows. To quote the actual words of the author—" Thus, in nature the Jīva is knowledge, a knower, a doer and an

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

enjoyer, under the control of Brahman and also a part of the Brahman. All these things are true of the Jīva in bondage as well as in salvation." (P. 7).

An interesting objection is raised with regard to the doership of Jīva. "If the Jīva is only a doer, it must always do only pure actions from which it would get only pleasure. But why does it do impure actions?" The objection is answered thus:

"There is no law governing the fruits of the past deeds. The Jīva does its actions impelled by past deeds, and at that time it does not know about purity or impurity of deeds. So, even though a doer, the Jīva is ruled by the deeds." (P 5).

Several explanations offered by Nimbārkācārya regarding several naughty objections are very fine and convincing. One such objection is against the Causality of Brahman. "Why should Brahman who has all His desires eternally fulfilled create this Universe?"

To this question, Nimbārka replies: "The creation of Brahman is the mere sport, just like, the sport of kings. In ordinary life, the play of an emperor, who has attained sovereignty, with various kinds of dice, wooden balls, etc. is a mere sport without any desire for fruit, so Brahmān creates the world in mere sport without any need." (P. 18).

Another objection which is equally natural is as follows: "If the Lord creates this universe in mere sport, then why is there unequality in the universe? Why is one happy and the other unhappy etc.? It means the Lord is not merciful, but is cruel."

Hence Nimbārka replies: "Unequality and cruelty of unequal creation and destruction, etc. depend on the deeds of the Jīva, just as the cloud in producing different kinds of shoots depends on their respective seeds. Thus Brahman is not responsible for the miseries and various lots of Jīva. Jīva is itself responsible through its own deeds." (P. 18).

"It may be said that it is not just or right that Brahman should give the fruits of deeds in accordance with the deeds of Jīva, as there was no difference between Jīva and Brahman prior to creation. So unequality and cruelty of unequal creation depend on the Lord." (PP. 18-19).

To this Nimbārka replies: "It is not so because the creation is beginningless. He creates the universe in accordance with the deeds of Jīva, which has been done by the individual souls in the previous creation. A subsequent creation cannot arise all of a sudden, so it depends on a prior creation." (P. 19)

The objection against the doctrine that Brahman is the creator of the world is as follows: "Brahman is not the material cause of the universe, because there is difference between Brahman and the world. Brahman possesses the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

attribute of sentience, while the world possesses just the opposite attribute of non-sentience and it is the rule, whatever is different from something has not that for its material cause. Just as the pot, which is different from the ether has not the ether as its material cause."

But Nimbārka points out "There is no rule that there will be a similarity between a material cause and its effect in every respect. So it cannot be said that the world, being different from Brahman, cannot arise from Him." As Śruti says : "There is the origin of hairs on the head and so on from a person from whom they are different, and of scorpions from the cowdung from which they are different." (P. 19).

It may be objected : "Brahman is the material cause of the universe, then He Himself will experience the pleasures and pains in the form of Jīva, so that there will be no difference between the enjoyer (viz. the Jīva) and the controller."

The answer to this is as follows : "Just as in ordinary life, though foams, waves and the rest, having the sea as their material cause, are all non-different from their respective causes, there is still a mutual difference amongst the particular effects themselves. In the same manner there may be a mutual difference between the enjoyer and the controller, although they are non-different from Brahman, having Brahman as their material cause." (P. 20).

The treatment of Chapter 2 of Part II on 'Origin And Development Of The Doctrine Of Difference And Non-difference' gives testimony of profound knowledge of different doctrines of different Ācāryas (both the predecessors and successors of Nimbārka-ācārya) on the part of the author. The author has remarkably succeeded in highlighting the main points of agreement as well as disagreement. Similarly chapter 5 of Part II on 'A Comparative Study Of The Relation Of Jīva And Brahman On The Basis Of Various Schools Of Vedāntā' throws a flood of light on the peculiarities of various schools of Vedānta.

The author has taken great pains towards grasping and clarifying the prominent features of the doctrine of natural difference and non-difference and also with regard to the nature of Jīva and Brahman as concerned with their relation.

Thus a very good study of the Philosophy of Nimbārka is provided by this book. The effort of the author is commendable.

But for certain mistakes of serious nature regarding the constructions of certain sentences, grammatical errors and spelling mistakes the book would have proved a success. The attention of the reader is drawn towards a few blunders as follows.

On P. 10, ll. 6-7 the translation in English of stanza 12 of Adhyaya 2 of Bhagavadgītā is absolutely wrong. The correct translation would be—"It is not that I was not present nor you nor these kings were present at any time in the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

past. And it is not that we shall not be present henceforward i.e. in future (births)."

On P. 13, verse 4 from Vedānta-Kāmadhenu is quoted and translated. In the translation we find that the word dhyāyema is rendered in English as 'I meditate' which should be as 'We should meditate' instead.

On P. 26, l. 6 we find that 'Brahman is difficult to see, .. etc.' It should be 'Brahman is difficult to be seen, .. etc.'

On P. 30, l. 7 the statement is made as follows : 'Hence the activity of the agent, too, is not useless. Here it cannot be said that as the pot already exists, like the lump of clay, the activity of the agent has no meaning.' Instead of the word 'like' in the above sentence there should be 'in the form of.'

On P. 36, l. 3 the word 'is' should be kept instead of the word 'to'.

On P. 50, l. 12 the word 'principal' is misspelt. It should be 'principle' instead.

On P. 55, l. 20 the word 'buddhāvasthā' is misspelt. It should be 'baddhāvasthā' instead. For the same mistake vide p. 67, l. 6.

On P. 55 foot note no. 4 the words 'gaccuti' and 'nāmarūpa' are wrongly transliterated They should actually be 'gacchanti' and 'nāmarūpe' respectively.

On P. 69, l. 21 the word 'Buddha-Jīva' is misspelt. It should be 'Baddha-Jīva' instead.

On P. 78, para 2, lines 4-5, the construction of the sentence which runs as '....again, if the māyā of Śaṅkara, is not accepted, too, is impossible' is faulty. It should be—'....again, if the māyā of Śaṅkara, is not accepted, then too, non-dualism is impossible.'

On P. 82 instead of foot-note numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 in the body we find foot-note numbers 5, 6, 3, 2, 4, 5. This could have been easily avoided.

On P. 82, para 2 in line 3 the word 'being' should be 'beings' and in line 4 the word 'is' should be 'are'.

On P. 83, para 2 in l. 7 'is consists' is wrongly put. Is should be dropped.

On P. 84, para 3 in lines 2-3 instead of Brahmad-sūtra "Vivakṣīt guṇopapatteśca" it should have been Brahma sūtra "Vivakṣita guṇopapatteśca."

On P. 85 para 2 l. 5 instead of '....never loss hold of me'; it should be '....never lose hold of me.'

On P. 86 para 3 in l. 1 instead of "....guhā praviṣṭau" there should be "..guhāṃ praviṣṭau". In the same place in l. 2 it is found that—'Here it is understood that there is two sentient being viz., Jīva and Supreme-self into the cave, ...' which should be '.. ..there are two sentient beings viz, Jīva . .' In

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

the same place in l 7 instead of ' ....who was manifested through the elements, ...' it should be ' ...who had been manifested through the elements....'.

On P. 87 para 4 in l. 4 instead of "anything eternal, nor anything internal." There should have been "anything external, nor anything internal."

On P. 100 para 5 in l. 2 walking is printed instead of waking. The same mistake is come across on P. 101 para 1 in l. 3-4.

Many more such mistakes can be pointed out. All of them should be rectified in case a second edition of this book is to be brought out.

Nowhere in '*The Philosophy of Nimbārka*' the date of Nimbārkācārya is mentioned even by way of a passing remark.

B. N BHATT

"*Dynamic Psychology of Early Buddhism*" by RUNE E. A. JOHANSSON (Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series No. 37). Published by Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies, Kejsergade 2, DK-1155, Copenhagen K, pp. 236, price not printed.

This book is a study in the Buddhist theory of causation (*Pratītyasamutpāda*—theory of dependent origination.) This famous series of twelve links in the chain of causation has caused a lot of controversy among philosophers—both of the empiricist school and the Absolute Idealist school of philosophers.

What is the meaning of a causal series ? A chain of causation is a series of C—E (causer effect) relation—one is the cause of the other and this other is still the cause of another etc. This series can be divided as follows :—

1. Those due to past life : *Avidyā* or ignorance. *Saṃskāra*s or predispositions or tendencies.
2. Those due to the present life : *Vijñāna* or consciousness of the self. *Nāmarūpa*—or mind-body. *Ṣaḍāyatana*—sense-organs. *sparśa*—contact. *Vedanā*—emotion. *Taṇhā*—craving. *Upādāna*—attachment or clinging.
3. Those of the future life : *Bhāva*—coming to be. *Jāti*—rebirth. *Jarāmaraṇa*—old age and death.

Thus this causal series connects past, present and future and presents an endless process of causation through succession of time. We are caught up in this wheel of causation.

The controversiai point in this series is that of *Saṃskāra* or predispositions or tendencies. Dr. Radhakrishnan tries to interpret this by translating *Saṃskāra* as preparation or arrangement or synthesis or action, (action-environment

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

dualism) will-force, or the spirit-energy, which determines new existence. The author uses the word condition, propensity, factor etc.)

In modern science it is the controversy of the 'gene'. The theory of *Saṃskāra* generated through past *Karma* is a theory peculiar to Indian philosophy. Modern biology has not found any link between physical, biological and spiritual aspect of this energy.

The early Buddhist texts have said " All *Saṅkhāra*'s are suffering ". This is an ambiguous sentence. Is it propositional ? It looks like a proposition but it is an exclamation. We say 'All are sinners' " Everybody is neurotic, " 'All *Saṃskāras* are suffering' to emphasize the point that the dividing line between Sin and Virtue, normalcy and neurosis, suffering and pleasure is not sharp. 'All *Saṃskāras* are suffering' is not a proposition. It is a way of saying that this world is full of suffering. The Buddhist philosophy in this sense may be called pessimistic. (It reminds us of existentialist philosophy which is a mood, not a philosophy). But it is not completely pessimistic. For the Buddhists also say there is a way out of this suffering.

The Buddhists, as the author says, are right in emphasizing the non-cognitive factor in perception. Stimuli are ambiguous and confusing. The state of the perceiver is often important in perception. The author rightly says on page 13, " most people can create an inner visual world without any impression at all e.g. in dreams or in remembering or imagining happiness or imagining terrors " and it is this Buddhism that emphasizes that *Saṃskāras* are born out of ignorance.

The author rightly emphasizes that the Buddhists have not succeeded in resolving the mind-body problem—what is the relation between *Kāya* and *Citta* ? The mediation through the senses makes us construct what we call the world. The world is a logical construction out of mind-body processes. The world is a dynamic process constantly being produced and deliberately constructed by our senses. But it is not subjectiveness.

Buddhist theory of consciousness is different from Idealist theory of consciousness. Consciousness is a condition of the body according to Buddhists. According to the Idealists consciousness is universal.

My own view is that we can overcome this world of suffering if we can reverse the process. The whole is a time process and time process is irreversible. Attainment of *Nirvāṇa* if it means extinction cannot be achieved by human beings nor is it sufficient to obtain happiness. *Nirvāṇa* must be a positive state of Bliss.

The author has done well to give us a series of charts explaining in detail the doctrine of dependent origination. As N. Smart says one of the ways of *Nirvāṇa* is release from re-birth.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Buddhist psychology and ultimately philosophy, looks like an empiricist philosophy because it does not believe in soul-substance. It believes in flux-becoming which is like Heraclitus and Bergson's philosophy. Everything is change—say these philosophies. They do not believe in a static psychology but in a dynamic psychology. Freud also believes in a dynamic psychology because he believes in the force of the unconscious mind which can disintegrate the ego.

But Buddhist philosophy is non-empirical also due to the following reason. They believe in re-birth, and *Saṃskāra* which originate from ignorance.

Also Buddhists believe in some sort of Magic power (*iddhi*).

The dispute between the empiricists and non-empiricists can only be solved by the unravelling of the ambiguity of the word 'energy'. The philosopher uses the word 'energy' in a quite different sense from what scientists (especially Einstein) uses the word 'energy'. Energy may mean psycho-physical energy or it may mean some sort of spiritual energy. Scientists agree with the Buddhists in saying that what we call matter-substance is nothing but energy ($E = mc^2$ said Einstein). The question is only what sort of energy ? The dispute can only be solved by believing in some sort of neutral monism. Interpreted in one way energy may mean physical energy, interpreted in another way it may mean mental or spiritual energy.

The Idealists would say that only if the Absolute is admitted can we solve the problem of overcoming the chain of causation (suffering). Time is in the Absolute, Absolute is not in time.

Lastly I would like to connect on the Buddhist sense of understanding. Understanding is connected with 'seeing'. But 'seeing' is different from 'seeing as'.

The Buddhists try to give us a behaviourist view of understanding. But Kant says understanding is non-empirical. Principles of pure understanding or categories according to Kant explain the world of phenomena. Understanding is non-empirical says Kant. Buddhist theory of understanding is not adequate to overcome the chain of causation which leads to suffering.

Cause is a category, a principle of pure understanding. The Vedantists say that the ultimate 'cause' is *Brahman* itself.

(On the whole, the book is a welcome addition to growing modern literature on dynamic psychology of Buddhism. The book is economically priced and is worth recommending).

S. H. DIVATIA

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

The Universal Faith by M. S. PARKHE, Pub. J. A. Mondkar, Pancha Sādhanā Prachar Kendra, Pune, Oct., 1978, pp. 170 + x, Price Rs. 15/-.

In every quarter of the globe sun, moon, planets i.e. the star-studded heavens have attracted the attention and challenged the observing powers of man. In worshipping the sun religiously and paying homage to the fiery God, it never dawned to the ancient man that some day he would be able not only to cook his food from the rays of sun but even cars and machines could be operated on solar energy. Attempts to convert the solar energy so as to compensate the depleting of varieties of conventional fuels are afoot frantically. The ancient Hindu verse of the *Gāyatrī* rightly praises the Sun as the giver of light, heat and fertility. In this context it is refreshing to read the above-mentioned book which throws light on sun-worship and sacrifices in the faiths the world over.

According to the author the highest scientific and technological achievements of today indicate the mono-directional growth of human mind in the welfare of physical realm. But instead of making man happy with these external aids, they have raised a number of problems. Again, what is more, the very existence of man confronts with a crisis due to abysmally destructive capacities acquired in the process. Besides, ideological differences in all spheres of human life are at loggerhead and the idea of ' one-world ' seems to be a great chimerical hope being exposed more and more vividly as time passes by.

In contrast to this state of things of modern civilization the author maintains that " the early man had attained the highest level of wisdom and the same is still the back-bone of his happy life " (p. 153). There was stability of the society and the world at large. The primitive or the so-called uncivilized man had the purest religion and the loftiest conceptions of the great creator. He was fully convinced regarding the pre-destined plan of the universe and the existence of some sort of Supreme Energy working at the back of it.

The proof regarding the universality and basic unity of ancient faiths could be evidenced by the revelations of the elevated souls or prophets who preached about the inward religion reflecting the same eternal and unfathomable energy of nature pervasive ubiquitously. These are known as ' avataras ' who symbolize Divine Appearance and manifest time and again so as to reestablish " the real objective which humanity should follow " (p. 8). One Rational Truth (*Satya Dharma*) is the foundation of all faiths.

According to the author the said fundamental culture is of Aryan origin in nature as the Vedas are considered as " the foundations of the ideals which humanity kept before its eyes throughout the whole history of man " (p. 17). It is a cultural diffusion of Hindus for some thousands of years back.

This pre-destined plan of the Divine heralding a New-Era is working on at present also. That is, a few months earlier than that of fateful Hiroshima

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

nuclear holocaust of August 1945, a pinnacle of man's scientific and techno. logical march ; Gajanan Maharaj (revered as 'Śrī' to his followers) took a vow that " I will rejuvenate the vedas ". His message of this New-Era is capsuled in the five-fold path namely sacrifice (*Yajña*), charity (*Dāna*), meditation (*Tapa*), right action (*Karma*) and self knowledge (*Swādhyāya*). The last four paths are acceptable universally to all religions. The path of ' sacrifices ' though extinct in some religions or with dubious status in some others, has been a constant strength and an individible part of man's religious search.

To man, the sacrificial rites have been " an acted prayer rather than a prayer in words " (p. 93). It is one of the ways of approaching God and getting all needs of life here and hereafter. The creation of fire is taken for granted as a medium to reach other subtle forces namely the Sun and the Absolute. This implies, in the words of the author, that " religion is not a mere social practice or a human continuance but a perennial activity of a timeless Being " (p. 166).

The limited objective behind the book which is written in the context of the above-mentioned message of the New Light, is to show how the fire-worship (*Yajña*) has been prevalent from the beginning of this world as the basis of human culture and how it is the foundation from pre-historic to historical faiths and down to the modern faiths viz. Bahai, Theosophy, Arya Samaj and such other movements.

Thus, ' the universal faith ' indicates the working of the Divine plan commonly binding all the isolated beliefs from ancient past to the present period. This is why since long long back the vedas upheld that Truth is one and one only and its revelations have been the basis of humanity's first and subsequent religions. The great mystics and reformists in various faiths are the mediators for the cause of the same Infinite Being.

After viewing the book as it is, let us be clearer of the issue in hand while reviewing.

Considerable subjectivism and anthropomorphic interpretation of primitive faiths regarding sun (along with moon and stars) as alive and quasi-human in nature quitely prevailed when genuine scientific inquiry entered the field. However at the same time man's rational awareness had unknowingly led him to the founding of astronomical and astrological sciences whose foreknowledge would help caution the vagaries of nature. The conventional attitudes on religion, sun-worship and sacrificial rites need to be revised in this new light.

The relevant querries are : Could man have had remained at the simple primitive stage for ever ? Could the concept of ' happiness ' remain same even after centuries ? (Refer the implications on page No. 154). The author is

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

confused by a too simplistic understanding of man with a galling ignorance of various dimensions of life. Life seeks its circles fully.

The point is that the present scientific culture, due to dynamic and evolutionary thinking, is deep-rooted irreversibly. In fact besides contributing material welfare, science has widened our social and mental dimensions too. Moreover, a ground for interchanging of ideas and sympathetic understanding of nations, seems ready. At this juncture, trumpeting bugles in the name of orthodox conceptual frame-work of religion is most likely to back-fire vehemently.

The human life is complex. It is a deep inward movement from one state of consciousness to another set of consciousness. The quest of the religious ideal namely the one Supreme Reality cannot be indifferent to socio-economic and cultural realities prevailing today. Making for a liberal and a rational awareness to the problems of technological ills is essential.

Here, religion does not question man's scientific quest of secular goals so much as man's outer achievements and correspondingly symbolizing his inner richness. The religious rationalism is a discriminating way out of this complex growth of mind. When Divinity is an inner experience to all faiths, all our external search till now is to be oriented accordingly.

That is, the secular era is to be co-incided with the redefinition of religion still more comprehensively. The modern changes are unprecedented in all walks of life and thought. So religious ideas also change and evolve with time. In other words, religion is not ready-made, but it is to be explored continuously for higher and higher goals. Instead of making the infallibility of final authority of truths, religion has just to be a way-side indicator for spiritual upliftment.

Again, author's banking on wide generalizations and patronizing statements such as for e.g. that " even earlier civilizations have traditions and beliefs based on the fundamental principles of life with those of vedic culture " (p. 15) sound improper. Our nationalist pride will blow off with an excruciating disillusion if we coolly analyze the life-styles and social structures of vedic people today. Westernism has percolated through and through as though we may have an outer garb of obscure and dubious vedic vision.

No doubt, the basic problem regarding the contrast between an ideal and fact presents itself in all societies. However, dogged substantiation from particular religious angle falls short of an objective assessment of human dynamics involved in the supreme quest of religion.

At some other place the author is reluctant in coining some knowledge as " animism or naturalism or totemism " (p. 155). But this does not mean that it is the ego of man which is responsible for it. All knowledge is developing and so mere apparent simple methods of sun-worship or fire-worship wo'nt do. The faith in religion is a progressive march from crude primitive outer levels to inner

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

search, from ritualistic action to moral action and from moral action to mystical and meta-physical purpose running through all creation.

Once more, the author is hazy in stating that oblation into the fire and recitation of incantations "give the worshipper some philosophical experience" (p. 156). In fact any type of 'worship' means adoration, sacrifice, praise, prayer, thanks-giving or other devotional acts performed in honour of the revered object. Here, the presence of the Supreme Being in the worshipped object is taken for granted and the feeling towards it and the acts of worship become one and the same thing.

Here comes the broader issue of the universal energy crisis ensued as it is by the mega-material craze of today vis-a-vis man's commitment and resposibility towards the reality around him. Historically, man's moral outlook is a leap by itself from magic, sacrifices and ritualistic approach concerning any problem facing him Man necessarily looks beyond anything that can be given in the facts of experience. That is, religion is bound to react the complex issue in hand from a subtler and befitting perspective

The true spiritual understanding requires alteration even in the methods of worship. The primitive type of worship and taking recourse to too simple practices would be vain philosophically and un-called for realistically. Man has to strike at the root. By delineating basic material needs, man has to diversify ways and means for saving energy and discriminating its use properly so as to be a vehicle for higher spiritual goal. Religious practices bereft of socio-political and historical relevance leave no influence. For e.g. recently there have been sacrifices in India involving staggering capital, precious ingredients of consumption and ungaining loss of millions of man-hours. Such sacrifices and worship are unbecoming in a country like India struggling with dire poverty and huge population.

From another stand-point man wills certain ends and that is what lends meaning to his life. Man has to examine his drives and motives constantly. Moral goodness precedes the spiritual search. Man's intellect and volition, feeling and imagination have to be so oriented spiritually as leading to an ultimate change of consciousness from periphery to the centre, a supreme meta-physical background.

The minimization of the barriers of time and space in the modern age makes religion strive for peace and harmony of the whole world. Bringing out inter-religious characteristics and particulars for practical application would be most invaluable. The author has given no importance to this aspect.

With all those remarks however, the book is certainly informative and interesting to readers of comparative religion. The forth-right presentation of ideas with a clear and easy diction would attract even a lay reader to go through it.

NITIN J. VYAS

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Pradyumnakumāra-Caupāi of Vacaka Kamalaśekhar, ed by MAHENDRA B. SHAH, Pub by L. D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad-380 009, pp. 90 + 94, Price Rs. 8=90 P.

In editing this work by V. Kamalshekhar, Shri Mahendrabhai appears to have taken good deal of pains and enthusiasm. His keen interest for both mediaeval and current Gujarati works is commendable.

Every change in story has been shown in brackets which helps in understanding the story and in maintaining the link. Introduction of the story is doubtlessly a successful effort. Although it is lengthy, which could have been avoided to a certain extent, but this story being sufficiently extensive the author can be conveniently absolved of this charge.

The author has been introduced to the reader by his other works giving gist thereby. Study of different factors constituting the story appears to have created interest in the author but the thesis would have been more authoritative and precise had the numbers of parallel stanzas of the original text been quoted with the relative incidences of the running matter. In all, eight fractions have been taken into consideration where this relationship has been maintained but it appears to be superficial e.g. :

(i) Disregard shown towards a sage calling at the door by somebody who is absent minded (p. 41).
(ii) Impression of creating love through a picture (p. 43).
(iii) Abduction of the child immediately after its birth (p. 44).
(iv) Elder brother's jealousy and conquest of younger brother (p. 51).
(v) Allegation of corruption (p. 64).
(vi) Illegitimate relation of a wife with another man.
(vii) Acquiring knowledge from the preceptor by deceitful means.
(viii) Combat between unknown father and son (p. 86).

The relativity of the above incidents with the original text has been shown against items 1, 3, 6, 7 whereas it has been omitted in respect of items 2, 4, 5, 8.

Unnecessary elaborateness in discussing various factors of the story leads to futility. Ordinarily, while editing a matter only instances of the concerned text are referred to, while in thesis, if they creep in it is no doubt objectionable and should be avoided.

The author seems to have referred to various books. It is, however, strange that no mention has been made of हरिवंशपुराण by महर्षि व्यास edited by Shri Ram Sharma which is in two parts and available at the L. D. Institute of Indology. In the second part of the said हरिवंशपुराण, there is a chapter named विष्णुपर्व which gives exuberant details about प्रद्युम्न. प्रद्युम्न the famous Yadava king is said to be the manifested incarnation of कामदेव through the parenthood of श्रीकृष्ण

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

and रुक्मिणी (महाभारत आदिपर्व) and is said to be the third form of श्रीकृष्ण (महाभारत अनुशासनपर्व—१५८-३९). प्रद्युम्न in his previous birth was the incarnation of cupid and was born of Rukmini for destruction of शम्बरासुर. The demon had abducted 'Rati' the wife of मदन, after his death. To avenge this cause he was born as प्रद्युम्न. Mayawati the wife of the demon was Rati incarnate. When शम्बरासुर knew the purpose of the birth of प्रद्युम्न at रुक्मिणी's house he immediately managed by deceitful means to remove the child which was six days old. This much is according to the text. (विष्णुपर्व ५-२८; हरिवंशपुराण २-१०४-१०७; भागवत १०-५५)

According to हरिवंश, the story slightly differs in as much as instead of throwing away his child into the sea, it is being handed over to Mayavati as she is in a dejected mood for having no male issue. The story in ब्रह्मवैवर्तपुराण corroborates with that in हरिवंश with the exception that the child is being brought about to मायावती by सरस्वती. After narrating the good as well as bad actions of शम्बरासुर and after criticizing these, प्रद्युम्न kills शम्बरासुर. In this regard, references in one form or the other are available from ब्रह्मवैवर्तपुराण ४-१२, महाभारत भीष्मपर्व ६५-७१; हरिवंशपुराण (२) ९०-४ (२) ९०-९१, महाभारत आश्वमेधिकपर्व ६५-३; जैमिनि अश्वमेध १२, गणेशपुराण १-४९.

Since references have been quoted from French, English, कथासरित्सागर, उपदेशप्रासाद, त्रिषष्टिशलाकापुरुष it is presumed that incongruity between Jainism and Hinduism has played an important part at the cost of such an educational enterprise, which is hardly pardonable. It is likely that this fact might have escaped the attention of the learned scholar, but it is sure to injure the feelings of any unbiased reader.

The portion relating to prosody p. 32 is really interesting and deserves special mention. The extent allocation and description of the matter is in order p. 33. But it is surprising that nothing bas been said about the then existing society or the social customs in such an extensive work. May be that the original text might be containing this but might have been willfully omitted while printing this work with a view to saving time and space. The thesis may be an ideal one even now if these items are incorporated in a small research work.

Lastly, an important point which I cannot desist from mentioning is that the publication which has been brought out by an institution of high repute under the able and competent guidance of an experienced director has unfortunately become a resort of printer's devil practically on every page.

VIDHATRI VORA

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1. *Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts in the Oriental Research Institute (Jodhpur collection) Part IV*, Edited by Late Muni Jinavijaya, published by the Director, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Jodhpur, pp. ix + 418, Price : Rs. 32-00.
2. *Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts in the Oriental Research Institute (Jodhpur Collection) Part V* : Edited by Omprakash Sharma, Publisher as above, pp. 6 + 178, Price : Rs. 17-00.
3. *Topics in Pāli Historical Phonology* : Edited by Indira Yashwant Junghare, published by M/s. Motilal Banarasidass, Bunglow Road, Jawahar Nagar, Delhi-110 007, pp. xii + 192, Price : Rs. 60-00.
4. ययाति-आख्यान: एक अध्ययन : by Girishchandra Sharma, published by Viveka Publications, 3/364, Samad Road, Aligarh-202 001, pp. xiv + 166, Price : Rs. 50-00.
5. महाप्रज्ञ—व्यक्तित्व एवं कृतित्व : Edited by Kanaiyalal Fulfagar, published by Mitra-Parishad, 1154, Chittaranjan Avenue, Calcutta-700 073, pp. 452, Price : Rs. 31-00.
6. दिनकर स्मृति अंक (मत-सम्मत) : Editor and Publisher: as above, pp. 30, Price : Not printed.
7. *The Sārasvata (Sanskrit Kāvya with Hindi Translation)* : Tr. by Rasik Vihari Joshi, published by Pandit Ramapratap Shastri Charitable Trust, 34, Rampratap Shastri Marg, Beawar (Rajasthan), pp. 54, Price Rs. 20-00.
8. *The Śrī Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta of Līlāśuka* : Editor and Publisher: as above, pp. 7[illegible], Price : Rs. 35-00.
9. *Tarkarahasya* : Edited by Parmanandan Shastri, published by the Director, K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, Museum Building, Patna-800 001, pp. xxxiv + 172, Price : Rs. 20-00.
10. *Gheraṇḍa Samhitā*: Edited by Swami Digambarji and M. L. Gharote, published by Secretary, Kaivalyadham, S.M.Y.M. Samiti, Lonavla-410 403, pp. xviii + 196, Price : Rs. 30-00.
11. *Mahā-Subhāṣita-Samgraha Vol. IV*: by Ludwik Sternbach, Edited by S. Bhakaran Nair, published by Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, Sadhu Ashram (P.O.), Hoshiarpur, pp. vi + 1597 to 2168, Price : Rs. 150-00.
12. *Exile and Kingdom (Some Thoughts on the Rāmāyaṇa)* : by Romila Thapar, published by the Secretary, Mythic Society, Daly Memorial Hall, Nrupatunga Road, Bangalore-560 002. pp. 44; Price : Rs. 10-00.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

13. *Chikitsa Vol. I—1979* : Edited by Shyam Kishore Lal & Arun M. Parkhe, published by Dharmatma Tatyaji Maharaj Memorial Medical Relief Trust, Shivapur, Akalkot (Dist. : Solapur), Maharashtra, pp. 104 Eng. Section, pp. 37 + 39 Hindi Section, Price : Rs. 35-00.

14. करुणाकटाक्षलहरी : by R. V. Joshi, published by Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, 1 UB Bunglow Road, Jawahar Nagar, Delhi-110 007, pp. 64, Price : Rs. 20-00.

15. मोहभङ्गम् : by R. V. Joshi, published by University of Jodhpur, Jodhpur, pp. v + 100, Price Rs. 30-00.

16. भारतीय भाषाओं के विकास और साहित्य की समृद्धि में श्रमणोंका महत्त्वपूर्ण योगदान : by K. R. Chandra, published by Prakrit Jain Vidya Vikas Fund, 77/375 Sarasvati Nagar, Vastrapur, Ahmedabad-15, pp. 32, Price : Postage expenses.

17. *'Chakra' The Symbol of Dharma* : by B. R. Sharma, published by Indian Institute of World Culture, Bangalore 560 004, pp. 32, Price : Not printed.

Publications of M/S Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Private Limited, Post Box No. 5715, 54, Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi-110 055.

18. *Brahmanas in Ancient India* : by Govind Prasad Upadhyay, pp. xxiv + 272, Price : Rs. 75-00.

19. *Foreign Elements in Ancient Indian Society* : by Uma Prasad Thapliyal, pp. xvi + 194, Price : Rs. 55-00.

20. *Historical Research in India* : by John Correia-Afonso, pp. 96, Price : Rs. 35-00.

21. *Music, Its form, function and value* : by Swami Prajnanananda, pp. xx + 182, Price : Rs. 55-00.

22. *The Philosophy of Tulsidas* : by Ramdat Bharadwaj. pp. xiv + 350, Price : Rs. 95-00.

23. *A Source-book of Indian Archaeology Vol. I* : by F. R. Allchin and D. K. Chakrabarti, pp. x + 354, Price : Rs. 60-00.

— ——

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Journal of the M. S. University of Baroda

The Journal is published every year in three parts. These parts are devoted respectively to topics relating to (1) Humanities, (2) Social Sciences and (3) Science.

Advertisement tariff will be sent on request.

Communications pertaining to the Journal should be addressed to :

The Editor (Humanities/Social Sciences/Science)
Journal of the M. S. University of Baroda
Faculty of Arts Compound
Baroda-390 002 (India)

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

INDEX INDO-ASIATICUS

POST BOX 11215, CALCUTTA-700 014

Index Indo-Asiaticus : An international based indexing quarterly. Surveys 600 current periodical literature on topics relating to the culture of India and ancient Asia, in all languages [Asian and non-Asian]; & also cumulative indexes to indological journals, to manuscripts & portraits. 1968, Rs. 50 p.a.

Distributors

For subscription write to:

Central News Agency, (P) Ltd., 23/90 Connaught Circus, New Delhi 1

Firma K. L. M. (P) Ltd., 257-B; B. B. Ganguly St., Calcutta 12

International Book House Pvt. Ltd., Indian Mercantile Mansion-extn., Madame Cama Road, Bombay 1.

Some Opinions

It will be very helpful to individuals and small libraries ...& to large institutions.

—Journal of Asian Studies—ann arbor 1969.

A very useful piece of work. Index Indo-Asiaticus is of great help to those who study India, as well as those who study history and culture of other Asiatic states. —Prof. Dr. V. V. Balabushevich, USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow.

Informative index Indo-asiaticus—Dr. J. Rahder, Professor Emeritus, U.S.A.

A very useful compilation of periodical literature on topics relating to the culture of India and ancient Asia.... I am sure the scholars will find the whole scheme attractive —Dr. Sunitikumar Chatterji, National Professor of India in Humanities & Emeritus Professor of Calcutta University.

Your work..will undoubtedly be useful —Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, Formerly President of the Republic of India.

Each one is stranger than the last, edited by the well-known Calcutta Librarian. —Dr. M. L. P. Patterson in Library Quarterly (Chicago), 1971.

Request

Authors & Publishers Are Requested To Send Their Publications For Inclusion In The Index. This Will Advance The Cause Of Research & Promote Sale Of Learned Journals. S. Chaudhari, Editor, Post Box 11215, Calcutta-700 014

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

LATEST BOOKS ON RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

Ancient Indian Tradition and Mythology—General Editor Prof. J. L. Shastri
Vols. I-IV: Shiva Purana, V-VI: Linga Purana, VII-XI: Bhagavata Purana, XII-XIV: Garuda Purana
A Critical Study of Mahavastu—Bhikkhu Telwatte Rahula
Brahma Sutra—Swami Sivananda
Buddhist Wisdom: The Mystery of the Self—G. Grimm
Buddhist Sects in India—Nalinaksha Dutt
Buddhacharita: Acts of Buddha—F.H. Johnston
Conquest of Suffering—P. J. Saher
Contemporary Indian Philosophy—B.K. Lal
Dimensions & Renunciation in Advaita Vedanta—Kapil N. Tiwari
Doctrine of the Jainas—W. Schubring
Enlightened Living—Tr. by Swami Venkatesananda
Gautama: The Nyaya Philosophy—N.S. Junankar
The Hindu Temple—2 Vols.—Stella Kramrisch
History of Indian Philosophy—5 Vols.—S. N. Dasgupta
A History of Indian Logic—M. M. Satiscandra Vidya Bhushan
Index to the names in Mahabharata—S. Sorensen
India and Indology—Selected Articles of Prof. W. Norman Brown, Ed. Prof. Rosane Rocher
Indian Studies in Philosophy—R. C. Pandeya
Journey with Death—Rohit Mehta
Kabir: The Apostle of Hindu Muslim Unity—Hedaytullah
Life af Yoga—Vimala Thakar
Life and Teaching of Sri Anandmai Ma—Alexander Lipsky
Madhusudan Saraswati on Bhagvad Gita—S. K. Gupta
Mahayana Buddhism—Nalinaksha Dutt
Maya Divine and Human—T. Goudriaan
Mystic Experience—Rajneesh
The Mysteries of Life & Death—Rajneesh
The Mystic of Feeling—R. C. Prasad
Nagarjuna's Philosophy—K. Venkata Ramanani
Nyayamanjari of Jayanta Bhatta Vol. I—Tr. by J. V. Bhattacharya
Ocean of Stories, 10 Vols.—Tr. by G. H. Tawney
Pratyabhijnahridyam—Tr. by Jaideo Singh
Quaranic Suffism—Mir Valiuddin
Rajput Painting—2 Vols.—Anand K. Coomaraswamy
Reflections on the Tantras—S. Chattopadhyaya

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Rise of Esoteric Buddhism in Tibet—Dr. Era Dargyaya
Sacred Books of the East Series, 50 Vols.—Ed. by F. Max Muller
Sankhya Sutras of Pancasikkha and Samkhyatattvalok—Hariharnanda Aranya
Saundarayalahari—V. K. Subramaniam
Seeds of Revolutionary Thought—Rajneesh
The Science of Meditation—Rohit Mehta
Studies in Buddhistic Culture of India—L. M. Joshi
Study of Yoga—Jajneshwar Ghosh
Taxila, 3 Vols - Sir John Marshall
The Prabhakar School of Purvamimamsa—Ganganth Jha
Vadiraja's Refutation of Sankara's Non-dualism—Clearing the way for theoism
—L. Mefford Betty

Vakyapadiya of Bhartṛhari—K.A.S. Iyer
Vedic Metaphysics—Bharati Krishnatirtha
Yoga of Guhya Samaj Tantra—Alex Waymann
Yoga System of Patanjali—J. H. Wood
Yoga as Philosophy and Religion—S. N. Dasgupta
Way of Tao—Rajneesh

For detailed Catalogue, please write to :—

M/s MOTILAL BANARSIDASS

Bungalow Road, Jawahar Nagar, Delhi-110 007.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

THE GAEKWAD'S ORIENTAL SERIES

GOS. Nos

153 PĀDA INDEX OF VĀLMĪKI RĀMĀYAṆA ; Vol. II —Edited by the Late G. H. Bhatt (1966) Rs. 35.00

154 KIRAṆĀVALI OF UDAYANĀCĀRYA—With Complete Text of the Praśastapāda-bhāṣya from a rare manuscript—Edited by J. S. Jetly (1971) Rs. 30.00

155 CHHAKKAMMUVAESO—of Amarakīrti—Edited by Madhusudan C. Modi (1972) Rs. 35.00

156 GAṄGADĀSA-PRATĀPAVILĀSA-NĀṬAKAM—by Gaṅgādhara—Edited by B. J. Sandesara and Pandit Amritlal M. Bhojak (1973) Rs. 12.00

157 ZAFAR UL WĀLIH BI MUZAFFAR WA ĀLIHI—An Arabic History of Gujarat Vol. II—by Abdullāh Muhammad Al-Makki Al-Āṣafi Al-Ulughkhāni Ḥajji Ad-Dabir, Translated into English by M. F. Lokhandwala (1974) Rs. 50.00

158 A DESCRIPTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE PRINTED TEXTS OF THE PĀÑCARĀTRĀGAMA, Vol. I—by Daniel Smith (1975) Rs. 50.00

159 SATYASIDDHIŚĀSTRA—of Harivarman, Vol. I—Sanskrit Text from Chinese translation by N. A. Sastri (1976) Rs. 65.00

160 ĀGAMAPRĀMĀṆYA—of Yāmunācārya—Edited by M. Narasimhachary (1976) Rs. 18.00

161 SMṚTICINTĀMAṆI—of Gaṅgāditya—Edited by Ludo Rocher (1976) Rs. 26.00

162 VṚDDHAYAVANAJĀTAKA -of Mīnarāja, Vol. I—Edited by David Pingree (1976) Rs. 94.00

163 VṚDDHAYAVANAJĀTAKA—of Mīnarāja, Vol. II—Edited by David Pingree (1977) Rs. 64.00

164 SOḌHALA-NIGHAṆṬU (Nāmasaṅgraha and Guṇasaṅgraha of Vaidyācārya Soḍhala—Edited by Priya Vrat Sharma (1978) Rs. 53.00

165 SATYASIDDHI ŚĀSTRA—of Harivarman—Vol. II (English translation)—by N. A. Sastri (1978) Rs. 92.00

166 ŚAKTISAṄGAMA TANTRA—Vol. IV : CHINNAMASTĀ KHAṆḌA—Edited by Late B. Bhattachryya & Pandit Vrajavallabha Dvivedi (1978) Rs. 49.00

167 KṚTYAKALPATARU—of Bhatta Laxmidhara : PRATIṢṬHĀKĀṆḌA Vol. IX—Edited by Late K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar (1979) Rs. 53.00

168 A DESCRIPTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE PRINTED TEXTS OF THE PĀÑCARĀTRĀGAMA—Vol. II—AN ANNOTATED INDEX TO SELECTED TOPICS by H. Daniel Smith (1980) Rs. 41.00

Can be had of :

MANAGER, UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS SALES UNIT, University Press Premises, Near Palace Gate, Palace Road, Baroda-390 001, Gujarat, India.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

Statement about the ownership and other particulars about newspapers

JOURNAL OF THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE

(To be published in the first issue every year after the last day of February)

FORM IV

(See Rule 8)

1	*Place of the Publication* :	Oriental Institute, M. S. University of Baroda, Baroda
2	*Periodicity of its Publication* :	Three Months—September, December, March and June
3	*Printer's Name* : (*Whether citizen of India*) (*If foreigner, state the country of origin*) *Address* :	Dr. A. N. Jani Yes Sultanpura, Jamkhana's Pole, Baroda-390 001
4	*Publisher's Name* : (*Whether citizen of India* ?) (*If foreigner, state the country of origin*) *Address* :	Dr. A. N. Jani Yes Sultanpura, Jamkhana's Pole, Baroda-390 001
5	*Editor's Name* : (*Whether citizen of India* ?) (*If foreigner, state the country of origin*) *Address* :	Dr. A. N. Jani Yes Sultanpura, Jamkhana's Pole, Baroda-390 001
6	*Names & addresses of Individuals who own the newspaper and partners or shareholders holding more than one percent of the total capital*	The M. S. University of Baroda, Baroda

I, A. N. Jani, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

A. N. Jani

Signature of Publisher

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

मन्दस्नेहा भविष्यन्ति ममानेनाज्ञकर्मणा ।
सुहृदः सहसंवृद्धा दुर्वातेन तिला इव ॥ ६५१ ॥

एवं चिन्तातु[1]रस्यागात् [2]परिणामं विभावरी ।
शिथिलीभूतनक्षत्रदन्तनेत्रेन्दुमस्तका ॥ ६५२ ॥

मुक्ता तारकचक्रेण सोडुपाऽपि विभावरी ।
मज्जति स्मार्णवार्णांसि प्रोच्छलन्ति ततोऽभितः ॥ ६५३ ॥

नूनं विश्वमिवात्मानमप्यन्तर्धातुमी[3]श्वरम् ।
तमस्तेन क्षणाज्जातमदृश्यं पश्यतोऽपि मे ॥ ६५४ ॥

दिशामुल्लापयन्तीनामिव पक्षिकुलारवैः ।
संमुखं बालमार्तण्डः शनैः[4] प्रासारयत् करान् ॥ ६५५ ॥

प्राचीं विस्तारि[5]तारुण्यां श्रयन्तं पतिमब्जिनी ।
वीक्ष्यालिच्छलतोऽमुञ्चदश्रुश्रेणिं घनाञ्जनाम् ॥ ६५६ ॥

मूर्त्यन्तरमिवौ[6]र्वाग्नेर्[7]ज्जानमिव विद्युताम् ।
उत्पतन्तं ततः शैलात् तेजःपुञ्जं व्यलोकयम् ॥ ६५७ ॥

किमेतदिति नि[8]र्यामैः सहोद्ग्रीवं व्यलोकयन् ।
अलङ्कारप्रभा प्रादुर्भूताऽद्भुततमार्द्धिकम् ॥ ६५८ ॥

लीलावहलितोत्साहवाह[9]वारणवाहनम् ।
मण्डिताकाशकासारपुण्डरीकोत्तरश्रियम् ॥ ६५९ ॥

पारिजातस्र[10]गामोदानुचरभ्रमरावलिम् ।
तत्राद्राक्षं खेचराणां व्रजन्तं व्रजमम्बरे ॥ ६६० ॥

अचिन्तयं नूनमयं विद्याधरजनो नगे ।
समासूत्रितसङ्गीतप्रीतः प्रचलितोऽधुना ॥ ६६१ ॥

तेषां वचनविन्यासै[11]र्वपुर्व्यासैर्विजृ[12]म्भितैः ।
अदवीयसि देशे तं सङ्गीतकपदं विदन् ॥ ६६२ ॥

पुनरुज्जीवदानन्दः कौतुकालोककौतुकी ।
तारकेण तरीं तारं प्रेरयामासिवान् पुरः ॥ ६६३ ॥

---

1. N. drops °तु°. 2. B. °गात्पारि° 3. B °मपीश्वरम्. 4. NK शतैः. 5. NPBK °स्तारता°. 6. NPBK °मिवोर्वा°. 7. NPBK °ग्नेमज्जा°. 8. B निर्यामैः. 9. N drops °वाह°; K °वारि°. 10. NPBK °श्रगा°. 11. NK °न्यासौ°. 12. B विभृज्जंमितैः.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

तिर्यग्निर्यातभूमीध्रपादान् दूरेण मुञ्च[1]ती ।
कियन्तमपि पन्थानं जवाद् यावज्जगाम नौः[2] ॥ ६६४ ॥

तत्कालनृत्तलो[3]कस्याभिनयानिव लीलया ।
अनिलान्दो[4]लनैर्व्योम्नि कुर्वत्याढ्यं पताकया ॥ ६६५ ॥

प्रौढालोकदुरालोकसर्वावयवसन्धिना ।
पद्मरागमयेनोच्चैः कलशे[5]नानुशीलित[6]म् ॥ ६६६ ॥

उच्छृङ्खलं प्रचलतः[7] स्तम्भनाय जगद्भृ[8]दः ।
दधानं पीतलध्यानं सौवर्णशिखरच्छलात् ॥ ६६७ ॥

जम्बूद्वीपमिवोद्दण्डजगतीजित्वरप्रभम् ।
महात्मनां मन इव समुन्नतिमनोहरम् ॥ ६६८ ॥

श्रीदार्णवसुवर्णाद्रिसर्वस्वेन विनिर्मितम् ।
तस्याद्रेर्मुकु[9]टं तावदद्रा[10]क्षं जिनमन्दि[11]रम् ॥ ६६९ ॥

प्राकारस्य तदीयस्य भित्तिमाश्रित्य दक्षिणाम् ।
प्रियामिव[12] मनोवृत्तिर्विशश्राम तदा तरी ॥ ६७० ॥

इतस्ततस्तदालोकव्यापारितविलोचनम् ।
अवदं तारकं तारमुदगारमहं गिरम् ॥ ६७१ ॥

सखे शिखरिणः पादैर्विषमोऽयमिहार्णवः ।
नाविका[13]नामविषयोऽखिलाब्धिविदुषामपि ॥ ६७२ ॥

दर्शनेनास्य निःशेषदर्शनीयशिरोमणेः ।
प्रयास इव जन्मापि प्राप साफल्यमात्मनः ॥ ६७३ ॥

साम्रा[14]ज्यमपि संत्य[15]ज्य भुक्त्वा कन्दफलाद्यपि ।
पशुतामपि संप्राप्य विप्रयुज्यापि बन्धुताम् ॥ ६७४ ॥

इहावस्थायिनो धन्या[16] येषां पुण्यं क्षणे क्षणे ।
प्ररोहतितरां सौख्यसर्वस्वं भुञ्जतामपि ॥ ६७५ ॥

---

1. B मुचती. 2. NPBK नौ. 3. B °लौक° 4. B. °लान्दौलनै° 5. NPBK कलसेना°. 6. NK शीलिताम्. 7. PNK प्रचलतस्तम्भनाय. 8. NPBK जगद्वृदः. 9. B drops °मुंकुटं. 10. NK °प्राक्षं. 11. B. °मन्दिरः 12. B प्रियामव. 13. PNK नाविकाणा°; B नाविकारणा°. 14. B सार्माज्य°. 15. B संव्यज्य. 16, NBK धन्पा.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

समानय पयःपुष्पप्रकरं च जवाद् यथा ।
स्नानशुद्धतमात्मानः पूजयामोऽत्र दैवतम् ॥ ६७६ ॥

तारकः स्माह विस्मेरसरोरुहवनास्विह ।
सुधाकुण्डसपिण्डासु वापीष्वापः स्फुरन्त्यलम् ॥ ६७७ ॥

पारिजातवनाघ्रातशिखरेऽत्र गिरीश्वरे ।
सुखानेयाः सुमनसो मरन्दमुदितालयः ॥ ६७८ ॥

परं[1] विज्ञापयामि त्वां कुमार हृदि चिन्तया ।
कथमत्र प्रवेष्टव्यमभ्यर्णे[2]ऽपि जिनालये ॥ ६७९ ॥

यत् तोरणपरिष्का[3]रं गोपुरं परिवीक्ष्यते ।
टङ्कच्छिन्नतटापीडप्राकारस्थं तदुच्चकैः ॥ ६८० ॥

लघुद्वाराणि यान्यत्र सम्भवन्त्यपराण्यपि ।
आकाशस्फटिकभित्तौ दुर्विभाव्यानि तानि नः ॥ ६८१ ॥

आर्द्रचन्दनमालाभिः प्रणालीप्रक्षरज्जलैः ।
विज्ञायमानाधु[4]निकसङ्गीतविरताविह ॥ ६८२ ॥

जनैर्नूनमशून्यत्वमिदानीमवगम्यते ।
तद् दृष्टिगोचरीभूतं पृष्ट्वा कञ्चिद् उपक्रमे ॥ ६८३ ॥ युग्मम् ॥

अभ्रंलिहजिनगृहव[5]प्रान्तेभ्रान्ततारके ।
तारके तारकेशाभवदने वदतीदृशम् ॥ ६८४ ॥

सुवर्णकङ्कणक्वाणप्रत्तप्राणप्रसृत्वरः ।
प्रस्खलन्मेखलादामसंवरप्रवरीकृतः ॥ ६८५ ॥

सिञ्चन्नमृतनिःष्य[6]न्दबिन्दुभिः कर्णकोटरम् ।
श्रूयमाणो विचलितग्रीवं वापीसितच्छदैः ॥ ६८६ ॥

यथा स देशं देशस्य शनैस्तारतसोऽभवत् ।
अजायत श्रुतिपथपथिको नूपुरध्वनिः ॥ ६८७ ॥ कलापकम् ॥

ध्वनेस्तस्या[7]नुसारेणास्माकं प्रेरितचक्षुषाम् ।
वप्रारूढा दृशां मार्गमी[8]युर्मृगविलोचनाः ॥ ६८८ ॥

---

1. B परि. 2. NK °भ्यणे°. 3. NPBK °परिस्कारं 4. NK °नाधनिक°. 5. B °गृहत्-प्रात°. 6. NPBK °निस्यंद°. 7. B °स्वप्या°. 8. B °मीमीयु°.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

याः सङ्क्रान्तं नदीकान्तजाङ्यं परिजिहीर्षवः ।
आतपं सेवितुमिवावतेरुर्जलदेवताः ॥ ६८९ ॥

यास्तमिस्रै[1]रिवोद्विग्नाः पातालान्नागकन्यकाः ।
चैत्यमीयुर्धृतालोकमर्कालोकविशेषितम् ॥ ६९० ॥

याः सुधालोडिततडिद्द्र[2]विणेनेव निर्मिताः ।
याः[3] पारिजातजन्मोर्वीं श्रिताः कल्पलता इव ॥ ६९१ ॥

तारणामिन्दु[4]लेखावद् वल्लीनां कल्पवल्लिवत् ।
विद्यानां शब्दविद्यावद् धे[5]नूनां कामधेनुवत् ॥ ६९२ ॥

देवीनां पद्मवासावत् तासामभ्यधिकां श्रिया ।
द्विरष्टवर्षदेशी[6]यां कन्यामेकामलोकयम् ॥ ६९३ ॥ युग्मम् ॥

आस्यं यस्या[7] विलोक्यार्कः स्वबन्धुपरिभावुकम् ।
मा गात् कष्टमितीवाभूच्छुचि छत्रमुपर्यदः ॥ ६९४ ॥

लावण्यसरणीमस्या[8] लावण्यं यात्विति न्यधात् ।
कपोलपालीं विपुलां कर्णपालीं ततो विधिः ॥ ६९५ ॥

यस्या आस्यदृशौ जिष्णू मृगलक्ष्ममृगौ युतौ ।
धात्रा योजयता सख्यं ख्यापितं शमशीलयोः ॥ ६९६ ॥

यत्तु[9]ङ्गस्तनयोर्यूनामधिरूढं मनो रयात् ।
परिश्रान्तमिवाशक्यं नावरोढुं कदाचन ॥ ६९७ ॥

एवं च समरकेतुकथया हरिवाहने[10] ।
समं कमलगुप्तादिकुमारैर्हृष्टचेतसि ॥ ६९८ ॥

अभ्येत्य वेत्रिणी स्माह कुमार कथयाऽनया ।
ससृजे श्रोत्रयोः[11] शर्म नेत्रयोः कुरु साम्प्रतम् ॥ ६९९ ॥

इत्युदित्वा चित्रपटमसौ प्रासारयत् पुरः[12] ।
कुमारस्तत्र लिखितं कन्यारूपं न्यरूपयत् ॥ ७०० ॥

मुहुर्मुहुर्मुखे कण्ठकन्दले स्तनमण्डले ।
नाभीनिवेशे जघनप्रदेशे पदबाहुषु ॥ ७०१ ॥

---

1. NPBK °स्तमिश्रै°. 2. NPBK तडित्द्रविणे°. 3. drops याः. 4. B °मिदु°. 5. NPBK धेनुनां 6. B °देवशीयां 7. NPBK यस्य. 8. NPB °स्यामस्या. 9. NB यत्तुग°. 10. NK हरिवाहते. 11. B श्रोत्रयोश°. 12. NK पुनरः.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

रागसागरशफरीं दृशं व्यापारयन् भृशम् ।
पटं समरकेत्वादिकुमाराणामदर्शयत् ॥ ७०२ ॥

वज्रार्गले कुतः प्राप्तस्त्वयाऽयं चित्रितः पटः[1] ।
इति पृष्टा कुमारेण वेत्रिणीदं व्यजिज्ञपत् ॥ ७०३ ॥

निजं नियोगमाधाय वनावनिदिदृक्षया ।
भ्राम्यन्ती द्रुषु[2] याताऽहमतिमुक्तकमण्डपम् ॥ ७०४ ॥

शया[3]नमब्जिनीपत्र[4]स्रस्तरे तत्र दारकम् ।
वैदेशि[5]कं पञ्चदशवर्षदेश्यमलोकयम् ॥ ७०५ ॥

तेनान्तिकमुपेताऽहं पृष्टा कस्य परिच्छदः ।
भ्रमत्ययमलङ्कारधन्यस्तन्वीत्यथावदम् ॥ ७०६ ॥

इहास्ति नृपतिर्मेघवाहनः शत्रुगाहनः ।
समस्तभरतक्षेत्रक्षेत्रसे[6]वाश्रमक्रमः ॥ ७०७ ॥

वैमानिकसुरश्रेणेः पुरो यस्य पुरन्दरः ।
प्राशंसच्छतशोऽनेकनिर्व्यूढभुजविक्रमम् ॥ ७०८ ॥

अर्थिनां[7] देयमेवेति व्रती लक्ष्मीं प्रसादयन् ।
महोदरार्थे मूर्धानं निजं चिच्छेद योऽसिना ॥ ७०९ ॥

सप्रसादश्रिया[8] दत्तः शस्त्रशास्त्रविशारदः[9] ।
तस्य सूनुरनू[10]नश्रीः कुमारो हरिवाहनः ॥ ७१० ॥

नृपपुत्रपरीवारः कीडोद्यानेऽत्र[11] सोऽधुना ।
जलमण्डपमध्यास्ते नवनूतलतावृतम्[12] ॥ ७११ ॥

पाण्डित्यनृत्यगीतादिकुशलानामहङ्कृताम् ।
विवादमस्ति भिन्दान इदानीं विज्ञसंसदि ॥ ७१२ ॥

दृशं स्वस्य चकोरीं[13] चेत् सुहितीकर्तुमिच्छसि ।
दर्शनेन कुमारेन्दोश्चल तर्हि मया सह ॥ ७१३ ॥

स स्माह विस्फुरच्छक्तिं श्रीपर्वतरसाश्रितम् ।
उत्सुकोऽस्मि स्वयमहं कुमारमवलोकितु[14]म् ॥ ७१४ ॥

---

1. B पिटः. 2. B द्रुषु. 3. NK drop श°. 4. B °श्रस्तरे. 5. B वैदेशकं. 6. NPK °सेवा°. 7. B अर्थिना. 8. B °दाश्रया. 9. B. °विशारदाः. 10. B °नूरनंश्रीः 11. B. °नेतृसो°. 12. B लाताद्वृत्तं. 13. B °रीवे°. 14. B °लोकितुम्.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

परं किमपि कर्तव्यं कृत्वाऽनुपदमेव ते ।
समेष्यामि मदुपदामुपादाय पुरो व्रज ॥ ७१५ ॥

इति प्रसेविकामध्यात् समाकृष्य प्रयत्नतः ।
अमुं स मेऽर्पयामास स्वहस्तलिखि[1]तं पटम् ॥ ७१६ ॥

असावेवं वद[2]न्त्येव तमीक्षणपथातिथिम् ।
गत्वा संमुखमानीय कुमाराय व्यनीनमत् ॥ ७१७ ॥

एह्येहीति गिरा स्निग्धदृशा चोपचितादरम् ।
समीपमुपविश्याथ कुमारं[3] व्याजहार सः ॥ ७१८ ॥

अप्रगल्भः प्रगल्भेन सकलासु कलास्वहम् ।
शिक्षणीयः कुमारेण यत्क्षू[4]णं चित्रकर्मणि ॥ ७१९ ॥

व्याजहार कुमारस्तं मित्र चित्रगतिस्तव ।
साक्षीकृतगुरुजनाऽजनि जाने स्वयंवरा ॥ ७२० ॥

अस्तोकचम्पकालोककलितं शैलमूर्धनि ।
इदं परिसरस्फारं सरः सरसिजोज्वलम् ॥ ७२१ ॥

रूपशोभापराभूतपुरुहूतपुरीजनम् ।
कन्यारत्नमिदं मूर्ध्नि विधृतातपवारणम् ॥ ७२२ ॥

एताश्च योषितश्चारुवेषा लेखाङ्गनानिभाः ।
एतत्परिच्छदीभूताः प्रभूता लिखिताः पटे ॥ ७२३ ॥

अमी मनुष्यसञ्चारचकिता विकृताननाः ।
लेखानामपि दुर्लेखा लिखिता हंससारसाः ॥ ७२४ ॥

परं पुरुषरूपेण विना नैतद् विराजते ।
यथा पुरुषकारेण सैन्यं शून्यं सुचार्वपि ॥ ७२५ ॥

एतन्मानेन पुरुषं क[5]र्तुं चेन्न भवान् विभुः ।
तदा त्वक्षूणपो[6]षाय लिखाम्यहमिहानय ॥ ७२६ ॥

स स्माह युज्यते सर्वमेतत् सामान्ययोषिति[7] ।
अत्र योषिद्विशेषे तु न क्षूणं दातुमर्हसि ॥ ७२७ ॥

---

1. NPBK °लिषितं. 2. NBK °वेव. 3. B कुमार. 4. NK. °क्षणं. 5. B कर्तु. 6. NBK °पेषाय. 7. B पोषित.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

पुरुषद्विष्टवामभ्रूरूपमेतत् [1]पटे कृतम् ।
ततः पुरुषरूपस्यावकाशोऽप्य[2]स्तु कीदृशः ॥ ७२८ ॥

सन्देहश्चेत् कुमारस्य पुंरूपकरणे मम ।
दर्शयामि तदेदानीमपि कृत्वा तव प्रभो ॥ ७२९ ॥

पुंरूपेण किमन्येन कृतेन यदि वा मम ।
निजप्रयोजनेनैतत् कृ[3]त्यं तावकमस्ति तत् ॥ ७३० ॥

मया कार्यविशेषेण व्याकुलेनापि संप्रति ।
त्वद्रूपलिखने हेतुः संक्षेपात् कथ्यते शृणु ॥ ७३१ ॥

अनेकनररत्नाढ्यवैताढ्य[4]गिरिमण्डनम् ।
अस्ति श्रीरथनूपुरचक्रवालाभिधं पुरम् ॥ ७३२ ॥

अन्वहं यत्र वादित्रध्वनयः खेचरश्रियः ।
भूरिभावैः प्रनृत्यन्त्याः कुर्युरचार्यकं परम् ॥ ७३३ ॥

रणार्जितजयश्रीणामालयस्तदपालयत् ।
क्रीडाक्रान्तद्विषच्चक्रश्चक्रसेननरेश्वरः ॥ ७३४ ॥

स्थिरास्तस्थुर्यदीयानां महासुकृतकर्मणाम् ।
सङ्ख्यानध्यानविगलच्चापला यद्गृहे श्रियः ॥ ७३५ ॥

अक्षूणदक्षिणश्रेणिनृपचूडामणिव्रजैः ।
सञ्जातसङ्ख्या यस्याज्ञा परं तेजोभरं दधौ ॥ ७३६ ॥

तस्यास्ति पत्रलेखायाः प्रेयस्याः कुक्षिसम्भवा ।
सुतोपयाचितशतैर्लब्धा तिलकमञ्जरी ॥ ७३७ ॥

यस्या सुलावण्यलवः पीयूषप्लवकल्पया ।
दृशाऽधुना कुमारेण चित्रमित्रं पवित्रितः ॥ ७३८ ॥

विलासेन गवामास्यं यदीयं श्रोत्रनेत्रयोः ।
प्रीणकं केवलदृशामिन्दुं मन्दयति श्रिया ॥ ७३९ ॥

निर्जितामपि रूपेण रतिं स्वाभीष्टवस्तुनि ।
योजयन्त्या अहं यस्याः पश्यामि नवगौरवम् ॥ ७४० ॥

कमप्यनीक्ष्यमाणा वा स्वरूपायोचितं वरम् ।
असौ प्रतीक्ष्यमाणा वा शैशवेऽङ्गीकृतावधिम् ॥ ७४१ ॥

---

1. B °भेस्पत्यटे. 2. B °प्यसु. 3. B कृत्य. 4. B. °वैताय°.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

स्वातन्त्र्यस्पृहयालुर्वा पारवश्याद्धि बिभ्यती ।
पाणिग्रहणनामासौ सहते न युवत्यपि ॥ ७४२ ॥

अनुरूपवरं चक्रसेनः खेचरचक्रभृत् ।
खेचरेष्वीक्षितुं काङ्क्षन्नादिक्षत् खेचरांश्चरान् ॥ ७४३ ॥

प्रज्ञप्तिर्भक्तिविज्ञप्ता स्वप्नान्तर्मातुरादिशत् ।
भूगोचरेषु वत्साया वरः कोऽपि भविष्यति ॥ ७४४ ॥

चित्रलेखां मदीयाम्बां सुताधात्रीं दिदेश सा ।
चित्रकर्मणि दक्षा त्वं सुता चात्रानुरागिणी ॥ ७४५ ॥

तद् आत्मीयपरीवारसारवारवधूजनैः ।
क्ष्माचरक्ष्माचरसुतरूपाण्यालिख्य लक्षशः ॥ ७४६ ॥

स्वस्वकालेख्यकलाकलापस्पष्टनच्छलात् ।
अस्यास्तिलकमञ्जर्याः समानीय प्रदर्शय ॥ ७४७ ॥

दाक्ष्य[1]दाक्षि[2]ण्यलावण्यभाग्यसौभाग्यसम्पदः ।
तदीया वर्णय पुरो वत्साया[3] वत्सलाशया ॥ ७४८ ॥

कुर्वाणानामिदमपि यदि चक्षुः कदाचन ।
विश्राम्यति तनूजायाः क्वचन क्ष्माधनात्मजे ॥ ७४९ ॥

मदम्बया प्रपद्येदं तदैव प्रहिता हिताः ।
उक्तोऽहं चाधिकारोऽस्ति गन्धर्वक तवाप्यसौ ॥ ७५० ॥

विचित्रवीर्यदेवस्य सुवेलवसतेः पितुः ।
पार्श्वेऽसि प्रेषितः किन्तु कार्यतः पत्रलेखया ॥ ७५१ ॥

ततस्त्वं शक्यसे वक्तुं नान्यत् किञ्चित् परं त्वया ।
आगच्छता वचोऽस्माकं विज्ञप्यं खेचरक्षितुः ॥ ७५२ ॥

या सा काञ्चीशकुसुमशेखरस्याग्रिमा प्रिया ।
देवी गन्धर्वदत्तेति नामसा[4]म्याद् विशङ्किता ॥ ७५३ ॥

रत्नकूटस्यायतने यात्रायां निशि च श्रुता ।
त्वया सा सैव गन्धर्वदत्ता देवस्य नन्दना ॥ ७५४ ॥

---

1. NPBK दाक्ष°. 2. NPBK °दाक्षण्य°. 3. B drops वत्साया. 4. B °स्याख्या°,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

यतो विनाऽपि देवस्यादेशं गत्वा मया स्वयम् ।
दृष्टा स्वज्ञातिवर्गस्याश्वा[1]सिता कुशलोक्तिभिः ॥ ७५५ ॥
पृष्टया च मिथः सम्यगावैजयन्त्युपप्लवात् ।
निजप्रवासवृत्तान्तः स्वयं सर्वो निवेदितः[2] ॥ ७५६ ॥
एवं विभाव्य देवेन सन्दिग्ध[3]व्यं न तां प्रति ।
इत्यतिक्रम्य तत्पुर्यां रात्रिमेकां पुनः प्रगे ॥ ७५७ ॥
विमोच्यात्मानमागत्य काञ्चीं तां भर्तृदारिकाम् ।
गन्धर्वदत्तामाराध्यागन्तव्यमविलम्बितम् ॥ ७५८ ॥
गच्छतस्ते सहायोऽयं चित्रमायनभश्चरः ।
सिद्ध[4]या बहुरूपिण्या विद्यया बलवत्तरः ॥ ७५९ ॥
इत्यवश्यं विधातव्यं राजकार्यं विजानता ।
धीमता गन्तुमेवाहमादेश्यो नान्यकर्मणि ॥ ७६० ॥
इदानीमुत्सुकतया सामान्यमपि रूपकम् ।
नेशः कर्तुं कुमारस्य यत्न[5]कृत्यं तु का कथा ॥ ७६१ ॥
अन्तरायो न कश्चिच्चेत् तदाऽऽगच्छद्दिवाऽप्यहम् ।
अवस्थाय कुमारस्य लिखिष्याम्येव रूपकम् ॥ ७६२ ॥
ततस्तिलकमञ्जर्याः पुरुषद्वेषिताग्रहम् ।
हरिष्ये बन्धुताचित्तसन्तापप्रकरैः सह ॥ ७६३ ॥
राज[6]कार्योद्यतः कालविलम्बे न क्षमोऽधुना ।
गच्छतस्तु निजं कार्यमपि किञ्चिदिहादिश ॥ ७६४ ॥
एतस्यां[7] दिशि लेखं वा सन्देशं वाऽल्पवस्तु वा ।
पुण्यपात्रस्य कस्यापि कृते मम समर्पय[8] ॥ ७६५ ॥
कुमारस्तमभाषिष्ट कृष्टदाक्ष्यादिसद्गुणम् ।
दक्षिणस्यां न लेखादिदक्षिणीयोऽस्ति कोऽपि मे ॥ ७६६ ॥
पराधीनो दिनमपि नावस्थापयितुं भवान् ।
शक्यतेऽस्माभिरीदृक्षकलाकेलिविचक्षणः ॥ ७६७ ॥
चक्रसेनसुतारूपमिदमर्पयता त्वया ।
समस्ताश्चर्यवीक्षाणां कृता वयमकौतुकाः[9] ॥ ७६८ ॥

---

1. NPB °स्वासिता°. 2. B निवेदित. 3. B. °गधव्यं. 4. B सिन्यथा. 5. NPB यन्न°. 6. B राजा°. 7. B एतस्या. 8. B समर्पयः. 9. B °कौतुका.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

दत्त्वाऽऽभरणवस्त्राणि ससंभ्रममविभ्रमः ।
समागच्छे द्रुतमिति कुमारो विससर्ज तम्[1] ॥ ७६९ ॥

ऊचे समरकेतुस्तु निजलेखं समर्प्य तम् ।
प्रत्यावृत्तः सुवेलाद्रेर्भवान्[2] काञ्चीं गमिष्यति ॥ ७७० ॥

तत्र गन्धर्वदत्ताङ्गजन्मनः कान्तिसद्मनः ।
दद्यान्मलयसुन्दर्या लेखं रहसि रंहसा ॥ ७७१ ॥

स तथेति प्रपद्यार्थमापृच्छ्य सपरिच्छद[3]म् ।
कुमारं चित्र[4]मायेन सङ्गतो वियता गतः ॥ ७७२ ॥

क्षणं नीत्वा कुमारस्तत्कथयाऽवसथे निशि ।
स्मरन् गन्धर्वकालापकलापं हृद्यधादिति ॥ ७७३ ॥

चक्रसेनसुतारूपमसरूपमुवाच सः ।
तादृक्प्र[5]तिकृतौ यस्या रूपलेश इति ब्रुवन्[6] ॥ ७७४ ॥

यद्यसौ तादृगेवास्ति तर्हि तुष्टेन वेधसा ।
जगत्त्रितयनेत्राणां सूत्रिताऽभू[7]तपारणा ॥ ७७५ ॥

विद्याधराणामन[8]या भवन्त्याऽजनि गौरवम् ।
अभवन्त्या[9] प्रियात्वेन लाघवं भुवनोत्तरम् ॥ ७७६ ॥

भूचरेषु वरोऽमुष्या भावीत्येतावताऽपि मे ।
अहो मनः समारब्धप्रचण्डतमताण्डवम् ॥ ७७७ ॥

तत्पाणिपल्लवं पाणिप्रणयीकृत्य कः कृती ।
लप्स्यते प्रथमां रेखां भाग्यसौभाग्यशालिषु ॥ ७७८ ॥

विकारास्तच्छू[10]तेः प्रादुर्भवन्तोऽङ्गे बलादपि ।
सङ्गोप्या इङ्गितज्ञानां कथमग्रे विप[11]श्चिताम् ॥ ७७९ ॥

क वैताढ्यः क[12] साकेतं स्पृहयंस्तां मृगीदृशम् ।
छु[13]रीकार इवाकाशं हन्तुमस्मि समुद्यतः ॥ ७८० ॥

व्यावर्तमानो मध्येन स किं खेचरदारकः ।
यास्यति क्षणमात्रक्या मैत्र्या मन्त्रितमानसः ॥ ७८१ ॥

---

1. B नं. 2. NPBK भवात्काची. 3. N °च्छहं; B °छंद. 4. NPBK चित्र°. 5. NP °त्रति°. 6. NPK ब्रुवत्. 7. B °त्रत°. 8. B °मनाया. 9. NPK °वंत्या. 10. K °तत्कतेः. 11. N विविप°. 12. B drops क. 13. K छरी°,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

समेतो वा स वैताढ्यं किमाढ्य[1]ङ्करणान् गुणान् ।
वदन् मयायत्तचित्तां राजपुत्रीं करिष्यति ॥ ७८२ ॥

इत्य[2]नल्पविकल्पश्रीविश्रामभवनं भवन् ।
दरिद्रो निद्रयाऽनैषित् स रात्रिं[3] कैरवोपमः ॥ ७८३ ॥

प्रातः प्राप्तसुहृद्वर्गस्त[4]देवोपवनं पुनः ।
स तद्वार्तासुधापानसङ्कृतस्थानमीयिवान् ॥ ७८४ ॥

तत्र चित्रपटारब्धवार्ताव्यतिकरेण सः ।
दिवसं गमयामास मांसलोत्कण्ठया सह ॥ ७८५ ॥

न[5]वोन्मीलितसौभाग्यमिवासौ दक्षिणां दिशम् ।
प्रेक्षमाणः क्षणमपि नेक्षणे विन्यवर्तयेत् ॥ ७८६ ॥

पश्यतोऽपि कुमारस्य वर्त्मनाऽगात् स दा[6]रकः ।
सन्तापवर्धनाद् ग्रीष्मः सापराध इवाभ्यगात् ॥ ७८७ ॥

मङ्गलातोद्यजीमूतध्वानसंनृत्तबर्हिणि ।
प्रविवेश जगत्याशु प्रावृड्[7]विश्वप्रियङ्करा ॥ ७८८ ॥

जाम्बूनदद्युतं विद्युल्लतां जम्बूपमेऽम्बुदे ।
तद्वर्णवर्णिकां पश्यन्नाश्व[8]सीन्न्यश्व[9]सीच्च सः ॥ ७८९ ॥

जलदे धृतकोदण्डे धारानारा[10]चवर्षिणि ।
भीतेव तस्य हृद[11]यात् सा भीरुर्नि:[12]ससार न ॥ ७९० ॥

घनैः प्रवर्षिभिस्तापः समं तद्विधुरीकृतः ।
प्रविश्य [13]हृदये तस्य तस्थौ विधुरबान्धवे ॥ ७९१ ॥

वरं वियोगिनां तापमान्तरं प्रतिकुर्वताम् ।
गच्छ[14]न्नुत्तरतां गीष्मो न प्रावृड्डुपहास[15]कृत् ॥ ७९२ ॥

तापमेवंविधमसौ धृतापि स्नेहले हृदि ।
चक्रे तस्य भवेन्नूनं प्रियोऽप्यप्रियकृत् क्वचित् ॥ ७९३ ॥

---

1. P °मार्थं°. 2. NK इत्यतल्प°; B इत्युन°. 3. NK रात्रि. 4. B °स्तादेवो°. 5. NK तवो°. 6. B दीरक°. 7. NPK प्रावृद्विश्व°. 8. NPBK °नास्वसी°. 9. NPBK °न्न्यस्वसी°. 10. B °रा° is dropped in °नाराच°. 11. P हृदयात. 12. B °भिःभिसार. 13. P हृदये. 14. B हांसनःकृत्. 15. गछन्नु°.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

व्यतिक्रान्तासु वर्षासु शरद् अम्बुजलोचना ।
शशाङ्कवदना सेव वीक्षितुं पाप तद्दशाम् ॥ ७९४ ॥

वेणुवीणाविनोदेषु विमुखोऽपि तदा पुनः ।
स प्रावर्तत सुहृदां स्वाभिप्रायं निगूहितुम् ॥ ७९५ ॥

प्रेषीन्ना[1]क्ष्यपि कौबेर्यां श्वा[2]सं श्रान्तोऽपि नामुचत् ।
नैच्छच्चित्रपटं द्रष्टुं शङ्का मा क्वापि भूदिति ॥ ७९६ ॥

गन्धर्वकस्यागमने सर्वथाऽनाशमानसः ।
अरत्या[3] तत्र च स्थातुमक्षमः क्षमापनन्दनः ॥ ७९७ ॥

अयं मनोविनोदाय यियासुर्दिशमुत्तरा[4]म् ।
देशवीक्षा[5]शयं मन्त्रीमुख्यैः क्षमापं व्यजिज्ञपत् ॥ ७९८ ॥

नृपानुमत्या[6] समरकेत्वाद्यैर्नृपजैर्युतः ।
सोऽथ चतुरङ्गचमू[7]वृतोऽचालीत् क्षणे शुभे ॥ ७९९ ॥

पदे पदे पदार्थानां चारुतां विज्ञदर्शिताम् ।
पश्यन् ददौ प्रयाणानि निर्विलम्बं स कानिचित् ॥ ८०० ॥

ग्रामानेतान् अ[8]दाद् देवः सत्राय स्मितमानसः ।
गृहा[9]रम्भनिमग्नानां दानमालम्बनं नृणाम् ॥ ८०१ ॥

व्योमोल्लेखिशिखो[10] रत्नकुम्भार्चिग्रस्तदिक्तमाः ।
नित्यं जगति नृत्यन्त्याः[11] स्वकीर्ते[12]र्दीपकोपमः ॥ ८०२ ॥

प्रासादोऽयं प्रसन्नेन देवेन श्रीमदर्हतः ।
समं जयपुरेणात्र कारितो विजितारिणा ॥ ८०३ ॥ युग्मम् ॥

उदीची[13]दण्डनाथेन श्रीमता नीतिवर्मणा ।
अक्षूणहूणनृ[14]पतिः पातितोऽत्र रणाङ्गणे ॥ ८०४ ॥

पोतैरपि सुखेनैवावगाढं वारिधिं हसत् ।
एतत् सरो दुर्विगाहं[15] महीयोभिरपि[16] ध्रुवम् ॥ ८०५ ॥

पूर्वजेन त्वदीयेन कारितं हारि तेजसा ।
इह स्नातेव तत्कीर्तिरजनिष्टामलीमसा ॥ ८०६ ॥

---

1. P °त्ताक्ष्य°. 2. NPBK स्वासं. 3. NPK अरत्पा. 4. B °मुत्तरा. 5. NPBK वीक्ष्या°. 6. NK °मन्या. 7. N चस्त°. 8. B °नदा° is dropped. 9. B गृही°. 10. B °शिषो. 11. N नृत्यंस्याः. 12. NPBK °कीर्तिं°. 13. NK उदीचीं. 14. P °तृपतिः. 15. K °गाहे. 16. P °रवि.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

सरितः पुरतोऽ[1]मुष्या देशः समरकेतवे ।
राज्ञाऽदीयत विद्वेषिविक्रमाम्भोधिसे[2]तवे ॥ ८०७ ॥

एवं पश्यं[3]श्चरोद्दिष्टान् देशानादेश्यभूभुजाम् ।
स्वश्रीकृताङ्गसौहित्यं लौहित्यं प्राप हेलया ॥ ८०८ ॥

विनोदैर्विविधैस्तत्र नयतः कालमन्यदा ।
मातङ्गसाधनाध्यक्षः पुष्कराक्षो[4] व्यजिज्ञपत् ॥ ८०९ ॥

कुमाराद्य करी वैरीयमदण्डाभिधो निशि ।
निर्गत्यागादरण्यानीमनीकमुखमण्डन[5]म् ॥ ८१० ॥

दृष्टश्चानुपदप्राप्तैस्तदाधोरणपूरुषैः ।
न शेके पुनरानेतुं स[6] तैर्यत्नशतैरपि ॥ ८११ ॥

ततोऽरण्येभयूथेन यावत् सङ्गच्छते न सः ।
तावत् साधनिकं कञ्चित् तमानेतुं समादिश[7] ॥ ८१२ ॥

एवमाकर्ण्य कमलगुप्तं शिबिररक्षकम् ।
कृत्वा सादी[8] कुमरोऽगात् समं समरकेतुना[9] ॥ ८१३ ॥

अह्नि चिह्नितोत्तु[10]ङ्गगिरिशृङ्गानुसारिभिः ।
दर्शिताध्वा हस्तिपकैस्तदरण्यमवाप सः ॥ ८१४ ॥

वन्यद्विपमदामोदात् पाषाणानिभविभ्रमान् ।
आघ्न[11]न्तं दन्तमुशलैः परिणम्य मुहुर्मुहुः ॥ ८१५ ॥

मषीपिण्डसपिण्डाङ्गं कृतसंहत[12]बृंहितम् ।
वर्षन्तं दानधाराभिर्धरागतमिवाम्बुदम् ॥ ८१६ ॥

अमान्तमिव चित्ता[13]न्तः क्रोधं सुचिरसन्ततम् ।
वमन्तमिव बन्धूकबन्धुभिर्दृष्टिदिष्टिभिः ॥ ८१७ ॥

भर्त्सयद्भिर्भृशं कैश्चित् ताडयद्भिश्च कैश्चन ।
सान्त्वयद्भिस्तथा कैश्चित् परिस्फुटवदु[14]क्तिभिः ॥ ८१८ ॥

पदबन्धोद्यतैः[15] कैश्चित् कैश्चिदङ्कुशपाणिभिः ।
आधोरणैः समाक्रान्तं[16] कुमारः[17] प्रैक्षत[18] द्विपम् ॥ ८१९ ॥

---

1. NK °नुष्या. 2. K °सेतेवे. 3. NPK पश्यं°. 4. K °क्ष्ये. 5. NB मंडतं; K मंडठं. 6. P drops स and adds it afterwards. 7. NPBK समादिशत्. 8. = सादीकृत्वा ? 9. N समरेकतुना. 10. N °ङ्गंग°. 11. K आघ्नंतं. 12. PK बृंहितं. B बृहितं. 13. K चिह्नांतः. 14. NPK °वदू°. 15. K °द्यनैः. 16. NK °क्रांत. 17. B कुमार. 18. NPBK प्रैक्षयत.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

कुमारः पाणिना वीणामादाय बिषमं क्षितौ ।
उपवीणयितुं वीणाप्रवीण उपचक्रमे ॥ ८२० ॥

कर्णातिथेर्ध्वनेस्तस्य करीन्द्रः[1] कर्णचापलम् ।
आतिथेयं करोति स्म विस्मृतक्रोधपाटवः ॥ ८२१ ॥

तेन वीणाप्रणादेन विलीनानां रुषामिव ।
अश्रुश्रेणिमिषात् पेतुः किल निःस्य[2]न्दबिन्दवः ॥ ८२२ ॥

मा भूत् पदरवैर्विघ्नो मम कर्णाध्वनि ध्वनेः ।
इतीव वारणोऽचालीत् मन्दमन्दपदप्रदः ॥ ८२३ ॥

स कुमारवराभ्यर्णमाजगाम मतङ्ग[3]जः ।
मर्यादामनु कल्लोलमिव[4] कल्लोलिनीपतेः ॥ ८२४ ॥

मन्त्रेण स्तम्भित इव समुत्कीर्ण इवाश्मनि ।
गलच्चैतन्य इव स निश्चलाङ्गरतदा स्थितः ॥ ८२५ ॥

मन्यमानः कुमारस्तं वशीभूतं वशाधिपम् ।
आरुरोह समुत्पत्य[5] [6]सृणिः [7]सृणिरिति ब्रुवन् ॥ ८२६ ॥

दिशो दिशः समादाय समादायाङ्कुशान् सितान् ।
आधोरणप्रवीणेषु धावमानेषु वेगतः ॥ ८२७ ॥

अधिष्ठित इवादृष्टप्रभावेण स केनचित् ।
करी चचाल तत्कालमुत्तालक्रमसङ्क्रमः ॥ ८२८ ॥

अयं गच्छ[8]त्ययं गच्छ[9]त्येवं कोलाहलाकुलाः ।
पत्तयः सादिनश्चामुमनुजग्मुर्मरुत्त्व[10]राः ॥ ८२९ ॥

इदमाकर्ण्यते घण्टारणितं [11]बृंहितं त्विदम् ।
एवं प्रतिपदं जातभ्रमः श्रममचिन्तयन् ॥ ८३० ॥

यातायात पथाऽनेनेत्युच्चैः संत्वरयन् नरान् ।
स्वयं समरकेतुस्तदरण्यं दिनमभ्रमत् ॥ ८३१ ॥

अस्तमीयुषि मार्तण्डे संपिण्ड्य सह सैनिकैः ।
कुमारानिष्ट[12]सूचाभिः सः द्रोर्मूलेऽनयन्निशाम् ॥ ८३२ ॥

---

1. B करीद्रः. 2. NPK निस्पंद°. 3. B मतगजः 4. NK drop कल्लोलमिव. 5. NK समुत्पत्य. 6. PB शृणिः; NK drop शृणिः 7. PB शृणि°; K श्रुणि°. 8. NP गछ°. 9. NP गंछ°. 10. NPK मरुस्वराः. 11. NPK बृंहितं. 12. P निष्ठशूचा°; NBK °शूचा°.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

पुनः प्रातभ्रमत्कर्णप्रकीर्णकविभूषितम् ।
तरुं दृष्ट्वा पथाऽनेन यातो हस्तीति निश्चयात् ॥ ८३३ ॥

गच्छ[1]न्नग्रे गिरिनदीतटं द्विपपदाङ्कितम् ।
पश्यन् विशेषतोऽयासीत् स कुमारदिदृक्षया ॥ ८३४ ॥

तरूणां निचितत्वेन विषमत्वेन चाश्मनाम् ।
न सादिनो व्रजन्त्यग्रे व्रतिनो दुर्गताविव ॥ ८३५ ॥

एवमावेदिते तज्ज्ञैः[2] केवलान् पुरुषान् पुरः ।
न्ययुङ्क्त युवराजोऽस्था[3]दरण्ये सैनिकैः सह ॥ ८३६ ॥

मिथः कथास्वपि जडैर्विषादात् सैनिकैर्वृतम् ।
युवराजं तृतीयेऽह्नि समीयुः प्रेषिताः नराः ॥ ८३७ ॥

तनुरेखापरिख्यातखदिरद्रु[4]मसङ्क्रमाः ।
क्षामताख्यायमानान्नपानीयपरिवर्जनाः[5] ॥ ८३८ ॥

मुखविच्छायताव्यक्तवाञ्छितार्थासमृद्ध[6]यः ।
अन्योन्यपृष्ठयवस्थानसन्मानितमनस्क[7]पाः ॥ ८३९ ॥

पृष्टाः कुमारवृत्तान्तं स्वयं समरकेतुना ।
विहितानतयः खेदमन्दामाददि[8]रे गिरम् ॥ ८४० ॥

युवराज तवादेशाद् वनदेशविहारिभिः ।
कुमारः प्रापि नास्माभिः कल्पद्रुरिव पापिभिः ॥ ८४१ ॥

दुश्चरित्रेण नाम्ना[9] च स मातङ्गः पुनर्भ्रमन् ।
ऋते कुमारमालोकि विना पुण्यैः पुमानिति ॥ ८४२ ॥

दर्शि[10]तस्वामिभक्तीनां दोषः कोऽप्यस्ति नात्र वः ।
इत्युक्त्वा[11] युवराजस्तान् विललापावि[12]लाशयः ॥ ८४३ ॥

हा बन्धो हा कलासिन्धो हा समाश्रितवत्सल ।
हा निःशेषगुणाधार हा सारस्नेहगेहभूः ॥ ८४४ ॥

प्रसादं कमलादेव्या नैमित्तिकवचांसि च ।
निन्यिषेऽलीकतामन्त्यां दशां गच्छ[13]न् गजाधमात् ॥ ८४५ ॥

---

1. P गछ° 2. NK तज्ञिः. 3. K °स्थो°. 4. B °द्रुमं°. 5. K वर्ज्जेवां. 6. NP समृद्धयः. 7. NP °सुपाः. 8. K °दगिरे. 9. NK नाम्ना. 10. B दर्शिति°, 11. NP °क्ता; K °क्तय. 12, NPK °बिला°. 13. NP गछन् .

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

स एवं विलपन् सर्वैः समं सामन्तसैनिकैः ।
यामिनीं समतिक्रम्य प्रभाते प्रोक्तवानिति ॥ ८४६ ॥

भो भो यान्तु भवन्तः श्रीस्कन्धावारे वदन्तु च ।
एवं कमलगुप्ताय कलिङ्गाधिपसूनवे ॥ ८४७ ॥

कुमारोपार्जितैर्वित्तैः सहैव सकलं बलम् ।
स्वामिने कोशलेन्द्राय द्रुतं गत्वा समर्पयेः ॥ ८४८ ॥

कुमारमनु[1]यास्यामि यो मामाद्येऽपि दर्शने ।
अमं[2]स्त सु[3]हृदं कर्मकरमप्यग्रिमः सताम् ॥ ८४९ ॥

स मां[4] विनाऽन्यलोकेऽपि प्रीतिं नाधिगमिष्यति ।
इत्यग्निसाधनेनाहं संगमिष्यामि तं द्रु[5]तम् ॥ ८५० ॥

आरचय्य ततस्तूर्णं चितामुचितकोविदः ।
स आप्तैर्विधृतोऽपि स्वं भस्मसात्कर्तुमाचलत् ॥ ८५१ ॥

तदा कमलगुप्तस्य हृत्तुल्यो लेखहारकः ।
अभ्येत्य[6] परितोषा[7]ख्यः कौमारं लेखमार्पयत् ॥ ८५२ ॥

हरिवाहननामाङ्को लेखः समरकेतवे ।
बभूव शो[8]कशल्यस्य विशल्यौषधिसम्भवः ॥ ८५३ ॥

स स्वेनाधिगतार्थं च लेखमाप्तकरेऽकरोत् ।
कथमा[9]गादयमिति तेनोक्तः स पुमान् जगौ ॥ ८५४ ॥

कुमारः क्वापि नापिती वाचि कर्णपथातिथौ ।
आक्रन्दाद्वैतमखिलस्कन्धावारजनेऽभवत् ॥ ८५५ ॥

प्रसादवित्तकजने मर्तुमेव समुद्यते ।
वेलावि[10]त्तेषु हन्तुं[11] स्वं समुक्षिप्तमहासिषु ॥ ८५६ ॥

तीर्थनिक्षिप्तकाष्ठेषु[12] वृद्धमन्त्रिषु वेत्रभृत् ।
लेखं कमलगुप्तस्य द्वारप्राप्तं समार्पयत् ॥ ८५७ ॥

तदैवातिप्रमोदेन सेनानीस्तमवाचयत् ।
स्वस्त्यमुष्या महा[13]टव्याः कुमारो हरिवाहनः ॥ ८५८ ॥

---

1. K °भतु°. 2. B असंरत. 3. NK drop सु°. 4. B मा. 5. N द्रुतं. 6. N °न्य. 7. NPK परितोखाख्यः. 8. B सोक°. 9. K कथमांगा°. 10. NPBK चित्तेषु. 11. NBK हंतुं 12. NPK काष्टेषु. 13. B मठाटव्याः.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

लौ[1]हित्यतटकटके सुहृदं चन्द्रकेतुजम् ।
यु[2]क्तं कमलगुप्तेन स[3]स्नेहं निगदत्यदः ॥ ८५९ ॥

अहमत्रास्मि कुशली तथा कार्यं यथा न मे ।
देवोऽपहारजां वार्तां वेत्ति दुःखाकरीमिति ॥ ८६० ॥

स संवर्तितलेखश्च दिक्षु संवीक्ष्य सर्वतः ।
भद्राः[4] केनायमानायीत्य[5]पृच्छ[6]ल्लेखहारकान् ॥ ८६१ ॥

यदा तेषु न कोऽप्याख्यत् तदा सञ्जातविस्मयः ।
आलोच्य मन्त्रिभिर्लेखं लिलेख स्वयमेव सः ॥ ८६२ ॥

द्वारोर्व्यां गोमयालेपशुचौ पुष्पादिपूजितम् ।
लेखं न्य[7]स्य ललाटाग्रयुक्तपाणिपुटोऽभवत् ॥ ८६३ ॥

कुमारलेखमादाय जनोऽयं येन जीवितः ।
सानुकम्पं स गृह्णा[8]तु विज्ञप्तिं[9] विज्ञ[10]धीरिति ॥ ८६४ ॥ युग्मम् ॥

तदैवान्तिकमाकन्दादागत्येकः शुकः खगः ।
लेखं चञ्चुपुटेनाशु गृहीत्वोदीच्यखं ययौ ॥ ८६५ ॥

सेनानीर्विस्मितः स्माह सह सामन्तमन्त्रिभिः ।
आनैषीद् अहहानैषील्लेखमेष कथं शुकः ॥ ८६६ ॥

कुमारकुशलोदन्तमनन्तस्नेहगेहभूः ।
युवराजो वने नाप्य शोकश[11]ङ्कुसमाकुलः ॥ ८६७ ॥

मान्यो मान्योचितं किञ्चित् कर्म कुर्याद् अनार्यकम् ।
इति लेखं समर्प्याशु तेनाहं प्रेषितः प्रभो ॥ ८६८ ॥

अहं मार्गस्य दुर्गत्वं विगणय्यागमं रयात ।
भवन्तमाश्रितजनमनःसङ्क[12]ल्पितप्रदम् ॥ ८६९ ॥

इत्याक[13]र्ण्य दुकूलानि निजाङ्गाभरणानि च ।
ददाति च तदा तस्मै युवराजः प्रसादतः ॥ ८७० ॥

अमात्यराजलोकेन समं सञ्जातभोजनः ।
मध्याह्ने स्वप्नपर्यन्ते स ह्[14]दीत्थमचिन्तयत् ॥ ८७१ ॥

---

1. NPBK लोहित्य°. 2. B जुक्तं. 3. NPK सस्नेहं. 4. N भद्रां. 5. NK °त्पृ°. 6. P °पृछ°. 7. NK त्यस्य. 8. B गृह्णातु. 9. K °ति. 10. NK drop °ज्ञ°. 11. P °संतु°, corrected later on as °संकु°; NBK °संकु°. 12. K °संकल्पितः. 13. B °कर्ण्य. 14. NK ह्रदी.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

कुमारो नामनिर्देशान्न[1] लिलेखाटवीमपि ।
मामन्वा[2]यास्यतामासीद् आयासः सुहृदामिति ॥ ८७२ ॥

नैवाबुद्ध[3] कुमारः किं युवराजः स मां विना ।
अनिर्दिष्टां भ्रमन् भूमिं भृशमायासमेष्यति ॥ ८७३ ॥

अङ्गार इव कर्पूरं तं कुमारं विनाऽधुना ।
कथंकारमहं यामि मेघवाहनभूपतिम् ॥ ८७४ ॥

स काय इव विच्छा[4]यः कुमारेण[5] विनाऽऽत्मना ।
सकलत्रोऽपि पृथ्वीन्दुर्दर्शनीयः कथं मया ॥ ८७५ ॥

सरसीव सरोजस्य तिष्ठतः शिबि[6]रेऽपि मे ।
विच्छा[7]यस्य विना मित्रं हृदयं भावि शुन्मयम् ॥ ८७६ ॥

अहं खलु भविष्यामि कुमारानुपदं गमी ।
द्वीपान्तरेऽपि दिवसः स्वमित्रमनुगच्छ्[8]ति ॥ ८७७ ॥

अप्रकाशितमेवैतज्जने परिजनेऽपि च ।
कर्तव्यमिति निश्चित्य स निशामनुपालयत् ॥ ८७८ ॥

छ[9]न्नं ममापि गन्तायमिति कोपादिवांशुमान् ।
बिम्बीफलकलालम्बी स बभूवापरो[10]ऽतिथिः ॥ ८७९ ॥

खगे देशान्तरं याति स्वनामबहुमानिनः ।
खगाः शाखिशिखारूढाः जगुः प्रस्थानमङ्गलम् ॥ ८८० ॥

पृष्ठे[11] प्रधाविता यान्ती मा हार्षीद् वैरिणी निशा ।
इति भीरुरिवाहः[12]श्रीर्गताऽऽदाय मणिं रविम् ॥ ८८१ ॥

दिनेशः सदिनः कास्तीत्यन्वेष्टुमिव शर्वरी ।
भुवनान्तः स्फुरद्दीपा प्रविवेशाविशङ्किता ॥ ८८२ ॥

दुष्टेन तमसा विश्वं नूनं स्यान्मलीनीकृतम् ।
इति कोपादिवाताम्रस्तुहिनांशु[13]रधावत ॥ ८८३ ॥

नियोगिन इव प्राप्तनियोगा जगदन्त[14]रे ।
राज्ञः कराः कृशतरा अपि प्रापुः परां श्रियम् ॥ ८८४ ॥

---

1. B °निर्देस्वन्न, 2. °मत्वा°. 3. NPK °बुद्धः. 4. NP विछायः; B छिछायः. 5. B °रेणा°. 6. NP शिविरे°. 7. NP विछाय°. 8. NP गछति. 9. K च्छन्नं, 10. N °पारा°. 11. NPBK पृष्टे. 12. NPBK °हश्री°, 13. K तुहिनांसु°. 14. N °दंतेरे.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

दक्षैरप्यलक्ष्यगतिपरिणामः सितद्युतिः ।
गगनाङ्गणमध्यास्त युवराजस्तदा सदः ॥ ८८५ ॥

सेवासमयसंप्राप्तं राजलोकं निजौकसि ।
निर्निदेशोचितालापकलापस्फुटसंमदम् ॥ ८८६ ॥

आत्मनोऽपि परीवारे निद्रामुद्रितलोचने ।
निशीथे निर्ययावेष निशितासिपरिच्छि[1]दः ॥ ८८७ ॥

पत्रपांसु[2]तृणाकीर्णेनाध्वना सञ्चचार सः ।
यथाऽनुपदिकः कोऽपि न भवेत् पददर्शनात् ॥ ८८८ ॥

दूरात् परिचि[3]तान् मुञ्चन् पथि केनाप्यनासजन् ।
मर्यादीकृतवैताढ्य उदीचीपथि सोऽचलत् ॥ ८८९ ॥

मध्याह्नसमये शैल[4]नदीकूलकृतस्थितिः ।
देवतावसरस्यान्ते फलान्याहरति स्म सः ॥ ८९० ॥

पुनःपर्याटपन्थानमायासं विगणय्य सः ।
नक्तं सिंह इवास्वाप्सीन्महीधरगुहागुहे ॥ ८९१ ॥

आपादमस्तकं मुक्तामणिप्रगुणितश्रियः ।
शतशः[5] शबरीः पश्यन् पयोधिलहरीरिव ॥ ८९२ ॥

सहर्षान् पर्षदासीनान् मषीसखतनुत्विषः ।
भिल्ला निभालयन् प्रेतराजस्यानुचरानिव[6] ॥ ८९३ ॥

अङ्गानां च नगानां च नारीणां चासितत्विषाम् ।
दर्शनादेकवर्णत्वं जानंस्तत्र तदापि सः ॥ ८९४ ॥

अनेकजन्तुसन्तानवधबाधानिबन्धनम् ।
भिल्लपल्लीकृतान्तस्य भल्लीवद् व्य[7]त्यवाहयत् ॥ ८९५ ॥ कलापकम् ॥

कुसुमैः सुरभीकर्तुं घनानामुपकारिणाम् ।
उच्चैरम्बरमभ्येयुः कुलीना यत्र पादपाः ॥ ८९६ ॥

कुजानां च ग[8]जानां च स्वच्छा[9]याकरशीकरैः ।
मिथो यत्रोपकर्तृ[10]णामेति मध्यं दिनं[11] सुखम् ॥ ८९७ ॥

---

1. NP °परिछदः. 2. NPBK °पांशु°. 3. B परिचिंतान्. 4. B शैम°. 5. B drops °शः. 6. NK °निवा. 7. NPB °वद्व्यत्य°; K °वद्व्यत्य°. 8. B चरगजानां. 9. NP स्वछाया°, 10. NPK °कर्तृणा°. 11. NK दिन.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

यस्यामहर्दिवं मत्तः सिंहनादः पदे पदे ।
आज्ञेव प्रेतराजस्य रुणद्धि[1] गतिमङ्गिनाम् ॥ ८९८ ॥

बहुदिव्यौषधिरपि व्याधी[2]नां या निकेतनम् ।
स्फुरत्शशधरौघाऽपि चित्रं तापपदाऽङ्गिनाम् ॥ ८९९ ॥

निर्भयत्वेन जानानः स भीमामप्यभीषणाम् ।
अटवीं तामती[3]याय व्यापत्तीमिव लीलया ॥ ९०० ॥

विहर्तुं वनमन्येद्युः कामरूपाधिपानुजः ।
गच्छ[4]न् मित्रधरोऽद्राक्षीत् तं मध्याह्ने पथि स्थितम् ॥ ९०१ ॥

युवराजः कथमसावेकाकीति विशङ्कितः ।
नत्वा क्षेमं कुमारस्य पृष्ट्वा तं सोऽनयद् गृहे ॥ ९०२ ॥

आवेदितापहारं तं कुमारस्यानुरूपया ।
भक्त्या[5] संपूज्य सर्वस्वं गृहाणेति जगाद सः ॥ ९०३ ॥

पाथेयमप्य[6]नादायानुयातं तं[7] निवर्त्य च ।
युवराजोऽप्यपन्थानमग्रिमं त्वरितोऽग्रहीत् ॥ ९०४ ॥

आर्यानार्यविशोऽमुष्य द्रुतमाक्रमतः क्रमात् ।
व्यतिचक्राम षण्मासी भूशयस्य फलाशिनः ॥ ९०५ ॥

पश्चिमेन स्फ[8]टिकाद्रेरुपवैताढ्यमन्यदा ।
एकशृङ्गगिरेः शृङ्गे स ददर्श महासरः ॥ ९०६ ॥

सौष्ठ[9]वेन प्र[10]देशानां रुध्यमानः पदे पदे ।
अदृष्टपारं यच्चित्रैरपीत्याख्यामगादिमाम् ॥ ९०७ ॥

एवंविधमतोऽन्यत्र सरो नास्तीति शाखिभिः ।
शाखामिषेण यत्रोच्चैः सर्वदिक्ष्व[11]र्दिताः कराः ॥ ९०८ ॥

चेलुः प्रतिदिशं यस्य वातोद्धूता महोर्मयः ।
सेना इव स्व[12]वन्तीशं गाम्भीर्येण जिगीषवः ॥ ९०९ ॥

सुस्वादुना गभीरेण निर्जित्यानेन नीरधिः ।
जाने निः[13]शेषवसुधामण्डलस्य बहिः कृतः ॥ ९१० ॥

---

1. NP रुणद्धि. 2. B व्याधीयानां. 3. NPBK °मतिया°. 4. NP गच्छन्. 5. B भक्तंपा. 6. PB °प्या°. 7. NK drop तं. 8. NPBK स्फुटिका°. 9. B °ष्ठ°. 10. NPBK प्रदेशानां. 11. NPBK °ध्वर्दि°. 12. NPK श्व°. 13. NK तिः°.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

उपर्यधश्च नेदृक्षमन्यन् मन्ये महासरः ।
वैताढ्यपातालभुजां तेनात्रायान्ति सुभ्रुवः ॥ ९११ ॥

कनकाम्भोजकिञ्जल्कसुरभीभूतवारिणि ।
तत्र स्नात्वा श्रमस्यादाद् युवराजो जलाञ्जलिम् ॥ ९१२ ॥

माधवीमण्डप[1]स्यान्तः समस्तश्रमहारिणि ।
सुष्वाप स्फ[2]टिकशिलातले तल्पानुकारिणि ॥ ९१३ ॥

वीचीनां ग्रास[3]मध्याह्नव्यतिवाहनहेलया ।
कृतकोलाहलध्वानं सिञ्चन्तीनां मिथः किल ॥ ९१४ ॥

रभसेनानिलैः सार्धं धावितैः शीकरोत्करैः ।
हृतशारीरसन्तापं तं निद्रा सहसाऽऽश्लिषत् ॥ ९१५ ॥

ददर्श दिष्टमाश्लिष्टमेकया कल्पवीरुधा ।
पारिजाततरुं स्वप्ने सहसा स व्यबोधि च ॥ ९१६ ॥

मित्रं ममात्र कुत्रापि ध्रुवं संगस्य[4]ते द्रुतम् ।
इति निश्चितवानेष सविशेषमुदास्पदम् ॥ ९१७ ॥

परितः स्फुरितोन्मेषां हेषां प्रवरवाजिनाम् ।
शुश्राव स्वप्नजानन्दमाकन्दमधुविभ्रमाम् ॥ ९१८ ॥

सोऽचिन्तयद् इहारण्ये हिंस्रश्वा[5]पदसम्पदि ।
नृपपदत्तरङ्गाणां तुरङ्गाणां क सङ्गतिः ॥ ९१९ ॥

परं जिष्णुर्नृपः कश्चिच्चलितः स्या[6]द् दिशां जये ।
मृगयाकाम्यया कोऽपि पल्लीपतिरथाभ्यगात् ॥ ९२० ॥

विद्याधरनृपः कोऽपि क्रीडितुं यदि वाऽऽगमत् ।
इति हेतुं ध्वनेर्ज्ञातुं निर्ययौ[7] स लतागृहात् ॥ ९२१ ॥

सरःपुलिनवैपुल्याद् बाहुल्याच्च महीरुहाम् ।
अयं किमपि नाद्राक्षीद् दिक्षु चक्षुः[8] क्षिपन्न[9]पि ॥ ९२२ ॥

ज्ञातेनापि किमेतेन समारब्धविरोधिना ।
एवं विमृश्य विश्रामं[10] विश्रमो गन्तुमस्म[11]रत् ॥ ९२३ ॥

---

1. P °मडप°. 2. NPBK स्फु°. 3. NPB drop °स°. 4. K °म्य°. 5. NPBK °स्वा°. 6. NPBK स्पा°. 7. NK निर्ययो. 8. NPK चक्षु; B. चिक्षु. 9. B क्षिपत्तिपि. 10. NPBK °म. 11. B °स्मिरत् ·

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

कृपाणं पाणिनाऽऽदाय पद्मसब्रह्मचारिणा ।
अंसेन स्फुरताऽक्ष्णा च दक्षिणेन कृत[1]त्वरः ॥ ९२४ ॥

सौ[2]न्दर्येण प्रदेशानां स्खल्यमानः पदे पदे ।
औत्सुक्येन च मनसस्त्वर्यमाणः पुनः पुनः ॥ ९२५ ॥

निर्विलम्बतया गन्तुं स्थातुं चायमनीश्वरः ।
प्राचीतडागतीरेण प्रतस्थे दिशमुत्तराम् ॥ ९२६ ॥

स वामदक्षिणक्षिप्तचक्षुरैक्षत हेलया ।
जलस्थलचरान् हस्तिहयप्रमुखजन्मिनः ॥ ९२७ ॥

स गतः सरसस्तीरमुत्तरं शोभयोत्तरम् ।
स देशेऽदर्शद् उद्यानमास्थानप्रतिमं मधोः ॥ ९२८ ॥

श्या[3]मं पुष्पाञ्चितं चान्तर्ध्वान्ततारामयं निशः ।
यन्निधानमिवाक्षय्य[4]मभेद्यं भानुरोचिषाम् ॥ ९२९ ॥

यत्र किन्नरयुग्मानां गायतां स्पर्धया मिथः ।
अभ्यस्यन्तीव सभ्यत्वं शृण्वन्तोऽवहिता मृगाः ॥ ९३० ॥

यत्रामन्त्रितमामोदैः परितः षट्पदीकुलम् ।
अनिर्धारितगमनं भ्रा[5]म्यन् निर्मू[6]च्छ्नायते ॥ ९३१ ॥

पश्यतां निर्निमेषाक्षि यस्मिन्नाप्या[7]यके दृशाम् ।
नराणाममराणां च नान्तरं जातु जायते ॥ ९३२ ॥

प्रज्वलन्त्यो महौषध्यो[8] यदाजह्रुस्तमो निशि ।
यत्र श्यामप्रभादम्भादुद्विरन्तीव तद्दिने ॥ ९३३ ॥

अहो कीदृग् अरण्ये[9]ऽपि मनसः स्तम्भनं वनम् ।
एवं कौतुकसंरुद्धपुरोगतिरिहाविशत् ॥ ९३४ ॥

वनान्तः कल्पवृक्षाणामेव ष[10]ण्डमखण्ड[11]रुक् ।
कुतश्चिच्चकितैर्देवैः कृतन्यासमिवासदत् ॥ ९३५ ॥

यत्रोपमानं किं तेषां कल्पद्रूणां भवत्विह ।
विवर्तः कमला येषां शृङ्गारो जगतामपि ॥ ९३६ ॥

---

1. B क्षत°. 2. B सौद°. 3. NPBK श्मा°. 4. NPBK °क्ष्यम°. 5. NPK भ्रम्यन्. 6. NP °मूर्छ्छ°. 7. NPK °प्या°. 8. NPK °ष्यो. 9. NPK °ण्ये°. 10. K खंड°. 11. N °डरखंम°.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

किमेकं वर्ण्यते तस्य कल्पद्रोरेक एव यः ।
समकालमनेकेषां दारिद्र्यं द्रोग्धुमीश्वरः ॥ ९३७ ॥

दलान्येव दुकूलानि मञ्जर्यो भूषणावलिः ।
फलं सङ्कल्पितं यस्य तरुः सोऽप्युच्यते जनैः ॥ ९३८ ॥

इति जल्पन् पुरोऽपश्यच्चै[1]त्यं नाम्ना सुदर्शनम् ।
राजत्यामूलचूलं[2] यत् पद्मरागशिलामयम् ॥ ९३९ ॥

यत्प्रभारुणितं व्योम वीक्ष्य प्राप्ताः पराह्[3]तिः ।
भास्करस्याश्वसन्तोऽश्वा वल्ग[4]न्ति मदमन्थरम् ॥ ९४० ॥

एतावदीदृशं कुत्र कर्त्रा दलितमाप्यत ।
एवं विस्मयविवशः प्राविशत् स तद[5]न्तरे ॥ ९४१ ॥

अपश्यन्मण्डपे तत्र मणिपाञ्चालिकागणम्[6] ।
स्फटि[7]कद्युति दुग्धाब्धौ खेलद्गोत्रमिव श्रियः ॥ ९४२ ॥

अनुभावेन केनापि स्त्यानीभूताऽमृतैरिव ।
विनिर्मितामष्टमहापतिहार्यपरिच्छदाम् ॥ ९४३ ॥

गभागारेऽनगारेन्द्रनाभेयप्रतिमामयम् ।
अदर्शद् दर्शनीयानां सीमानममितत्विषम् ॥ ९४४ ॥

भुवनेष्वप्यसम्भाव्यं तद् रूपं स निरूपयन् ।
संप्रमुग्धोऽविदग्धोऽपि स्थित्वा नत्वा तमब्रवीत् ॥ ९४५ ॥

भ[8]र्तश्चिन्तामणिः पाणिं कल्पद्रुमें[9] गृहाङ्गणम् ।
कामधुग् वेश्मनो मध्यमध्यास्तेऽद्य त्वदीक्षणात् ॥ ९४६ ॥

निःशेषासुखकन्दानाममन्दानां कुकर्मणाम् ।
स्थानं संसारकान्तारमतीतोऽद्य त्वदीक्षणात् ॥ ९४७ ॥

इत्यभिष्टुत्य चैत्यस्य जगतीमीक्षितुं भ्रमन् ।
हरिवाहननामाङ्कं स श्लोकमशू[10]णोत् तदा ॥ ९४८ ॥

हरिवाहन विभ्राणे त्वयि दानधुरं चिरम् ।
निश्चिन्तः खेलतु[11] वने नन्दने कल्पपादपः ॥ ९४९ ॥

---

1. B °वै°. 2. B चूडलं. 3. NPK °इतिः. 4. B वलांति. 5. PNBK °तंदं°. 6 NBK. °गण. 7. NPBK स्फुटिक°. 8. NPB भर्तः श्रि°; K भरत°. 9. NPK °मेगृं°. 10. K °सृं°. 11. NK °नु·

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

सुस्व[1]प्रादिसमुत्पन्नानन्दसञ्जीवनौषधैः ।
ध्यानस्तस्यानुसारेण याम्यद्वारेण स व्रजन् ॥ ९५० ॥

रम्यतायामकुण्ठस्य मठस्य प्रविशन् मुखे ।
उत्तीर्णमुपरि क्ष्मायाः स गन्धर्वकमैक्षत ॥ ९५१ ॥

युवराजं स गन्धर्वः प्रत्यभिज्ञातवानपि ।
संप्रमुग्धः पुनस्तस्थावसंभाव्यतया[2] तथा ॥ ९५२ ॥

अये गन्धर्वक इति तेनोक्तः स स[3]सम्भ्रमः ।
दिष्ट्या युवराट् समरकेतुरित्युक्तवान् नतः ॥ ९५३ ॥

वातायननिषण्ण[4]रतं पदसंवाहनोद्यतम् ।
अगाधसत्त्वो[5] गन्धर्वं सोऽगदद् गदतांवरः ॥ ९५४ ॥

प्रत्यहं स्पृहणीयेन दर्शनेनैव ते वयम् ।
जाता गतश्रमाः सम्यक्कार्यसिद्धेरिवाधुना ॥ ९५५ ॥

भ्रातः प्रातः समेष्यामीत्युक्त्वा त्वयि तदा गते ।
अनागच्छ[6]ति कुशलवार्तामप्य[7]प्रयच्छति ॥ ९५६ ॥

शरीरकारणं किञ्चिदासीत् तस्यान्तरायकम् ।
यद्वा दैववशात् किञ्चित् कार्यान्तरमुपस्थि[8]तम् ॥ ९५७ ॥

विस्मृता वा वयमिति त्वच्चिन्ताचा[9]न्ततचेतसा ।
गतं नः स कुमाराणां कष्टान्मासचतुष्टयम् ॥ ९५८ ॥

झगिति प्रत्यभिज्ञानान्न तावद् विस्मृता वयम् ।
द्वितीयेऽह्नि भवान्[10] कच्चिन्मलयाद्रितटेऽगमत् ॥ ९५९ ॥

ऊचे विचित्रवीर्याय चित्रलेखार्पितं वचः ।
गन्धर्वदत्तां [11]द्रविडराजकान्तां[12] तथैक्षत ॥ २६० ॥

मल्लेखस्तत्सुतापाणिपद्मभ्रमरतां गतः ।
कियन्तमपि कालं त्वं कच्चित् काञ्च्यामवस्थितः ॥ ९६१ ॥

क[13]च्चित् तिलकमञ्जर्याः क्वापि प्राप्युचितो वरः ।
चित्रमायः सहायस्ते कुत्रेदानीं स वर्तते ॥ ९६२ ॥

---

1. K °खप्ना. 2. NK °तथा. 3. NK मसं°. 4. B °निषण°. 5. PNBK °सत्वो. 6. NP °छ°. 7. NPK °प्य°. 8. PN °स्ठि°. 9. NPBK °वांत°. 10. K °स्क°. 11. B इद्र°. 12. K °कांता. 13. K क्व°.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

The Critical Edition of
THE VĀLMĪKI RĀMĀYAṆA

				Rs.
Vol.	I	BĀLAKĀṆḌA	(PP. 101+461)	100
Vol.	II	AYODHYĀKĀṆḌA	(PP. 96+706)	200
Vol.	III	ARAṆYAKĀṆḌA	(PP. 82+416)	100
Vol.	IV	KIṢKINDHĀKĀṆḌA	(PP. 112+466)	100
Vol.	V	SUṆDARAKĀṆḌA	(PP. 49+496)	100
Vol.	VI	YUDDHAKĀṆḌA	(PP. 1109+156)	200
Vol.	VII	UTTARAKĀṆḌA	(PP. 3+666)	125

For further particulars please communicate with the Manager,

UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS SALES UNIT,
University Press, Near Palace Gate, Palace Road, BARODA-390 001

THE GAEKWAD'S ORIENTAL SERIES

163 VṚDDHAYAVANAJĀTAKA—of Mīnarāja, Vol. II—Edited by David Pingree (1977) Rs. 64=00

164 SOḌHALA NIGHAṆṬU—Edited by Priya Vrat Sharma (1978) Rs. 53=00

165 SATYASIDDHIŚĀSTRA—of Harivarman, Vol. II (English translation) by N. A. Sastri (1978) Rs. 92=00

166 ŚAKTISAṄGAMA TANTRA—Vol. IV: Chinnamastā Khaṇḍa —Edited by Late B. Bhattacharyya and Pandit Vrajavallabha Dvivedi (1978) Rs. 49=00

167 KṚTYAKALPATARU—of Bhatta Laxmidhara: PRATIṢṬHĀ-KĀṆḌA Vol IX—Edited by Late K. V. Rangasvami Aiyangar (1979) Rs. 53=00

168 A DESCRIPTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE PRINTED TEXTS OF THE PĀÑCARĀTRĀGAMA—Vol. II—AN ANNOTATED INDEX TO SELECTED TOPICS by H. Daniel Smith (1980) Rs. 41=00

Can be had of :

UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS SALES UNIT, UNIVERSITY PRESS, Near Palace Gate, Palace Road, Baroda-390 001

Printed by Shri B. M. Shah. Manager, The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda Press (Sadhana Press), near Palace Gate, Palace Road, Baroda, and published on behalf of M. S. University of Baroda by Prof. A. N. Jani, Director, Oriental Institute, Baroda, July, 1980.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh.

JOURNAL
OF THE
ORIENTAL INSTITUTE

M. S. UNIVERSITY OF BARODA, BARODA

Editor : **A. N. Jani**

The JOURNAL OF THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE, BARODA is a Quarterly published in every September, December, March and June.

SPECIAL FEATURES :

Articles on Indology, textual and cultural problems of the Rāmāyaṇa, Epic & Purāṇic studies, Notices of manuscripts, Reviews of books, Survey of contemporary Oriental Journals and the publication of rare works forming the Maharaja Sayajirao University Oriental Series, are some of the features of the Journal.

CONTRIBUTORS TO NOTE :

(1) Only typewritten contributions will be accepted. Copies should be retained by the authors for any future reference, as no manuscripts will be returned.

(2) *To maintain uniformity in transliteration in all the papers published in the Journal of the Oriental Institute, it is essential that all contributions should follow the standard system of transliteration (c = च्, ch = छ्, ś = श्, ṣ = ष्, etc.).*

(3) All contributions to the Journal should be sent to the *Director, Oriental Institute, Tilak Road, Opp. Sayajigunj Tower, Baroda-390 002.*

SUBSCRIPTION RATES :

	Annual
Inland	Rs. 30/- (Post-free)
Europe	£ 3.00 („ „)
U.S.A.	$ 10.00. („ „)

Subscription is always payable in advance. The yearly subscription is accepted from September to August every year. No subscription will be accepted for less than a year. Subscriptions to the Journal may be sent to—

The Director, Oriental Institute, Tilak Road, Opp Sayajigunj Tower, Baroda-390 002, Gujarat, India.